

## ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION<sup>1</sup>

EUROPE agreed at Lausanne on July 8th to reconstruct itself, if possible, economically, and succeeded in getting rid of the commercial incubus of Reparations. But so many other sources of financial malaise—tariff conflicts, monetary disorder and the like—were then envisaged that real and permanent recovery was felt to be impossible unless the whole world combined to adopt the necessary remedies. Political harmony called for economic harmony as a first step. Hence the immense significance of the impending World Economic Conference.

Fourteen years after the Armistice of November, 1918, war is still being waged. This war, like the other war which it succeeded, is being waged on four fronts. The struggle has been transferred from the military to the economic field, embracing even more nations than were previously engaged, for now there are no neutrals. It is the baneful fruit, the natural nemesis of Versailles, of that treaty which was so unjust and unwise—unjust because it was vindictive and without charity; unwise because it has ruined victors and vanquished alike. An economic war, waged, not with guns and shells but with economic weapons, it has involved soldiers and civilians alike, men, women and children, and is causing them as real a suffering as did the actual fighting, in bereavement, poverty and unemployment. And this war, as I said, is being waged upon four fronts—Armaments, War Debts and Reparations, Trade Restrictions, and lastly, Shipping Subsidies and Discriminations.

To-day we stand on the edge of the abyss. To quote a Resolution adopted by the Council of the International Chamber of Commerce last October—"conditions in every country become daily more critical, confidence wanes, commerce stagnates, unemployment spreads and enterprise is paralysed."

The world was never in greater need of peace—of the Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ. In the words of the Holy Father, quoting the Prophet—"We looked for peace and no good came; for a time of healing and behold

<sup>1</sup> The substance of a lecture delivered at the C.S.G. Summer School at Oxford on August 10, 1932.

fear. . .” Since the close of the military phase we have heard twelve years of international “talk” and endured an ever-rising tide of “nationalism” in action. The will to co-operate has not been strong enough; the need for co-operative action has been obscured by national ambitions and national greed. But if we are to have peace we must recapture the conception of Christendom, not only as a spiritual and cultural entity, but as an economic unit. Economic co-operation is a corollary to the establishment of the spiritual Peace of Christ, for by it the fear and egoism which separate the nations can be removed.

Whether the League of Nations becomes strong or remains weak, the Church remains the real League of Nations. If proof be needed, we have only to look at the late Eucharistic Congress in Dublin, where people of every nation, age and class showed how the common bond of a devotion to a great ideal can overcome all minor differences founded on worldly interests and exploited by the politicians.

Nevertheless, some advance towards economic peace has been achieved. I will speak later of the problems which remain to be solved, but here it is right to record the efforts made between 1918 and 1931. I will leave the achievement of Lausanne until we come to the question of war debts. The progress which has been made in economic adjustment is mainly due to the work of the Economic Section of the League and the International Chamber of Commerce. Let me give you a few examples. The financial work of the League has a special significance to-day, not only for what it has achieved, but because it has already attacked problems which are in part those we are still faced with. It is represented by two main achievements—

(1) *The Brussels Conference of 1920* which told the nations to balance their budgets, stop inflation, reduce expenditure, return to the gold standard, remove obstructions to international trade, improve transport, and restore *real* peace.

Nobody listened at the time, but gradually Governments were forced to realize the wisdom of this advice, and, so far as currency and finance were concerned, to act on it.

(2) *The reconstruction of Austria.* The history of this achievement is particularly valuable to us for two reasons—

(a) it shows that the sources of public and private charity

have not dried up. The Pope's Encyclicals urge charity concurrently with economic re-organization. Austria was kept alive for three years by public loans, afterwards treated as gifts, amounting to £25,000,000, while £10,000,000 was given by private charity.

(b) The Austrian situation in 1921 was in many respects a miniature of the world-situation to-day. The League reported that the *sine qua non* of settlement was the cancellation of Reparations and international debts due from Austria, and on this basis proposed a Scheme of Reconstruction. Nothing, however, was done for fifteen months because the approval of the U.S. Congress could not be obtained. Meantime, the Austrian currency crashed, but in spite of increased difficulties the League ultimately secured the adoption of a programme of reconstruction involving stabilization of the currency on a gold basis; balancing of the budget; retrenchment.

The words of the Financial Committee's Report are ominous for ourselves in like condition—"The alternative is not between continuing the conditions of life of last year or improving them. It is between enduring greater hardship . . . or collapsing into a chaos of destitution and starvation. . . ."

Other advances towards economic peace may be classified as—

(1) "*Economic Disarmament.*" The problem of tariff warfare was the main subject of the Economic Conference at Geneva in 1927. The Conference, which was composed indiscriminately of protectionists and free-traders, came to a unanimous conclusion that—"The time had come to put an end to the upward movement in tariffs and to move in the opposite direction." As in the case of the financial recommendations of the Brussels Conference, nothing was done to give effect to this, although the upward tendency of tariff walls was arrested. It, however, inspired M. Briand's idea of an Economic Federation of European States, of which we have not heard the last. It was followed by an attempt to abolish import and export prohibitions and by the abortive Tariff Truce of which the late Mr. Graham was the author.

And (2) "*Freedom of the Seas.*" On the high seas economic co-operation has achieved some success. The Maritime Ports Convention of 1923 checked a dangerous

reaction towards discrimination which was on the point of breaking out both in America and in Europe.

The part played by the International Chamber of Commerce in Economic Peace-making has been one of increasing responsibility and importance. When the war ended the business world was quick to realize the need for economic co-operation, and the formation of the International Chamber of Commerce in 1920 was the expression of that need. The constitution of the Chamber proclaims its object as—"to promote peace and cordial relations among nations," by the settlements of disputes and problems, and the removal of obstructions to trade.

The principles for which it stands were further defined—"It is not the aim or desire of business to promote any class interest. Healthy business conditions depend upon and advance the prosperity of all classes."

The International Chamber has been behind the scenes in all the great international attempts to promote economic co-operation and disarmament. Many of the principles now accepted were first suggested by its members, and many of the steps taken to improve the world owe their inspiration to this source. The League now recognizes them as the mouth-piece of the business world and consult them on all economic matters.

From the start in 1920 the International Chamber of Commerce has urged the principles of the Brussels Financial Conference, the establishment of credit facilities—its members first sketched the Ter Meulen scheme for international credit—the free circulation of capital by removing double taxation, *i.e.*, taxing the same income in two or more countries, and the international co-operation of Stock Exchanges and the co-operation of Capital and Labour. But it was in 1923 and 1925 that they began to attend to the major problems of reparations, debts, budgets, and exchanges. "The peoples of the world demand, and are entitled to have a *just* solution of these problems," they declared, and elaborated proposals for dealing with these problems which have in part been carried out. The Chamber was behind the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. It did the spade work for the World Economic Conference of 1927 and its report on Trade Barriers became the text-book from which the Conference drew its conclusions. In the same way it prepared the ground for the work of the League on



"Freedom of the Seas," and has since followed it up with a Report on Barriers to Maritime Navigation—customs difficulties and the like—which the League of Nations is now endeavouring to remove.

In connection with shipping, I would also mention the International Shipping Conference, a "parliament" of ship-owners of seventeen countries, who have worked in close touch with the League and the International Chamber of Commerce on both general and technical problems, and in particular the problem of "Freedom of the Seas" and the raising of the standard of safety of human life at sea.

That is a very broad outline of the Economic Peacemaking which these two bodies—the League of Nations and the International Chamber of Commerce—have been engaged in, and of the extent of their success. You will see on the one hand that they have done much useful and necessary work, on the other that much remains to be done. In fact, the League and the International Chamber have set the stage for economic reconstruction. It is time for the curtain to go up and the play to begin. Let us now consider in detail the "four fronts"—Armaments, Reparations and War Debts, Trade Restrictions, and Shipping Subsidies and Discriminations.

*Disarmament.* Europe is wasting money on armaments at the rate of £2,000 millions a year. Why? Because no country can trust its neighbours, and national ambitions prevent the nations pooling their resources to guarantee each other security against aggression. Yet there is no real danger of war. The only serious factor which we have to take into account is the avowed and unabated intention of Russia to produce a world revolution. That may well lead to armed attack by Russia, if and when she has organized her industries and transport. It is a remote danger, and we could guard against it by creating a united European defence force to meet attack from this or any other quarter. Surely, it is worth the experiment to dispel fear and liberate £2,000 millions a year for the improvement of industry and employment.

*Reparations.* It may be easy to be wise after the event, but it has taken us twelve years to understand, in spite of St. Paul's analogy of the Body and its members, that you cannot place intolerable burdens upon others without suffering yourself.

The original assessment for Reparations was for 132,000 million gold marks or £6,500 millions. This was reduced to £2,200 millions under the Dawes Plan and again to £1,800 millions by the Young Plan. The Young Plan marked an advance, since it "commercialized" Reparations, removed them from the sphere of politics, and placed them in trust. The creation of the Bank of International Settlements for this, among other purposes, was another step forward. Even so, the Plan provided for payment of Reparations until 1988! Before these Plans were devised, the attempt to collect Reparations too quickly in 1921 produced the crash in the German exchange when million-mark notes were being hawked as curios on the streets of London. Germany recovered by wiping out her capital liabilities, starving her *rentiers*, cutting wages and salaries, working harder than ever, and borrowing from America to pay the Allies! This went on until the speculative boom in America brought its inevitable crash, when America began to call in her loans. Germany was faced with bankruptcy and the bankruptcy of Germany would have exposed Central Europe to Bolshevism. The politicians became really frightened and, at Lausanne, fear has done what neither justice, reason nor self-interest could do. Reparations and all the economic and moral evils involved with them have gone. Germany agrees to contribute "when she can" 150 million pounds to a fund for European Reconstruction. It is not only that the amount of the burden is now reduced to insignificance. A new direction has been given to international settlements. The idea of Reconstruction replaces that of punishment. We can breathe at last. Lausanne looks like the coming of the dawn, the first return of Europe to sanity.

*War Debts.* It is, however, only the first step. The Lausanne agreement is conditional upon a settlement of inter-allied war debts. The crux of that settlement is Great Britain's debt to America. America must realize that she cannot hope to receive debts which she prevents her debtors from paying. These debts can only be paid in gold, goods, or services, such as shipping, banking, insurance and investment. America and France have collected nearly all the gold and locked it up. America shuts out goods by a high tariff wall and does her best to prevent being paid in services. Indeed, she may well pause to consider whether she really

wants us to pay her, for, if she insists on payment by Great Britain, *in no way can payment be made save by her importing over the next 50 years £4,500 million worth of British goods.* At a time when she herself has 12 million unemployed the artificial addition of such an enormous volume of goods to her imports, in competition with her own factories, would be disastrous to her.

As to the non-war ordinary debts of Governments, reckless borrowing in the years preceding the slump and the spending of that money on unproductive purposes, contributed to the strain which broke the financial machine last year. These causes are preventing further loans needed for reconstruction and stopping the free circulation of capital which will be needed when trade revives. Confidence must be restored in the lender, and that can only be done by cutting out waste and extravagance. The alternative is a crop of defaults which would again throw Europe into a turmoil.

*Trade Restrictions.* The world is dependent for food, material, and employment upon the exchange of goods and services. Before the industrial era, a couple of centuries ago, each country was largely self-supporting. Some luxuries were imported, but the population fed and clothed itself on what the soil produced. Like the race of the Cyclopes in the Odyssey they were economically and politically independent and had no need to trouble themselves about their neighbours. All that has gone. *No country can now live in isolation.* Most countries have developed populations far in excess of what they can themselves support, on the assumption that trade and industry will provide them with work and food. This, however, depends upon trade and industry keeping pace with population, *i.e.*, upon maintaining the exchange of goods and services.

Yet the more dependent the nations become on such exchange, the faster becomes the mad race of tariffs and restrictions upon that exchange. Everyone wants to sell, no one to buy; and these two opposite policies are destroying the fabric of world trade.

Some years ago, Sir Clive Morrison Bell produced a scale model of the tariff walls of Europe. It showed a single continent cut up into many watertight compartments each divided from the other by a high brick wall. There could be no more striking picture of the folly of excessive economic nationalism.

Tariff barriers, which were originally designed to protect national trade, have been pushed up and up until they threaten to bring international trade to a standstill.

I have already referred to the urgent but ineffectual plea of the Geneva Economic Conference (1927) to bring tariffs down. The Lausanne agreement provides for a new World Economic Conference which we mentioned above. If that Conference is going to do any good it will have to start a downward movement in tariffs. All States must give up some of the protection they have enjoyed. If they don't there will soon be no trade to protect. If they do they will gain in expanding trade more than they lose. It will be a matter of bargaining and, with Great Britain now in possession of a bargaining tariff, there is a better prospect of success. People do not value a thing, until they are in danger of losing it. The danger of losing world-trade has made the world realize how much it is dependent on it.

Worse even than tariffs are monetary restrictions which prevent buyers in one country from paying the sellers in another. This problem hangs on that of exchanges. Stability in the value of money must be restored. *A world currency is needed.* Gold has been cornered and the nations who have been forced off the Gold Standard will not lightly trust themselves to it again. Yet we must work back to an international standard of values. It has been suggested that those nations who are prepared to accept sterling as an international standard instead of gold should group themselves together in what is called a "sterling area." If this were possible it might well provide a bridge to a stable world-currency.

Production should be regulated by internal co-operation in each industry so that supply may be adjusted to demand. In the long run "booms" are as dangerous to industry as depressions; excessive profits bring their own retribution. The object should be to spread production and keep prices at a steady moderate level. In this way employment can best be stabilized.

It is often urged that there is over-production and, while this is true of some industries, it is not a general or permanent phenomenon. Over-production is a relative term. It exists only in relation to a consumption rendered deficient by maldistribution. It is the machinery of distribution which has

broken down because the wheels are clogged by political interference, direct and indirect. Restrictions on the free exchange of goods and services by disturbing the natural flow of trade upset the balance of economic life. As an example—in the agricultural countries of Central Europe—tariffs on wheat have been forced up twice as high as the world price of wheat! The wheat, therefore, reaches the consumer at three times its natural value, *i.e.*, its price plus a duty twice the price. The consumer cannot afford to buy much at this price, so the wheat grown locally is left to feed the rats in the granaries. The farmer goes poorly; he cannot sell. The buyer goes empty; he cannot buy. The Government reaps small profit as little trade passes the customs barrier it has erected.

The fourth "front" is *Shipping Subsidies and Discriminations*. There are to-day  $13\frac{1}{2}$  million tons of shipping lying idle in the ports of the world. Why? Partly because there are forty per cent fewer cargoes to carry than there were two years ago. But it goes deeper than that. Governments, both in Europe and America, have spent and are spending vast sums on subsidizing the building and running of ships, reckless of whether there is any trade for them to carry. This, too, at a time when by trade restrictions, they have curtailed the volume of cargoes. In addition, almost all Governments impose stupid formalities upon ship or cargo, and some of them still discriminate against foreign ships, that is, they give preferences to their own ships. All of this has to be paid for in unemployment, either in the factory, the shipyard or among the seamen. There will be no health in the shipping industry until this economic warfare on the high seas is replaced by a co-operative movement to put the industry once more on an economic basis.

So far I have only touched on the more immediate problems of economic co-operation. But when these are solved we shall only be at the beginning. The world is passing through a far more profound crisis than is revealed in the superficial dangers of debts, tariffs and discriminations. It is evident that a change is in progress. The world is again crossing one of those dangerous bridges which span the chasm between one age and another. We are moving towards a new order. What is that order to be? Certainly not the old individualist capitalism of the nineteenth century.

Elimination by bureaucracy of its waste and inefficiency? Consider the result of bureaucratic control in shipping. The American Government, during and since the war, went into shipping and its loss now exceeds £1,000 millions; the Australian Government lost £12 millions on its ships and then wisely gave up; the Canadian Government is still in the business and has already lost £3 millions!

Is the new order to be Communism with its inner spirit of extreme materialism—its subjection of the individual to a slave service of the State for the sole purpose of material production?

It is difficult for a Catholic to speak of Russia with the scientific calm of an economist. We know what the Russian Government stands for—the denial of God; the rooting out of religion; the destruction of the family, of marriage, of the rights of the soul; the organization of human life into one vast and horrible piece of mechanism. We know the methods which that Government have employed to force the Russian people into the mould from which human nature revolts—the persecution of all religious bodies, especially of Christians and Catholics, the horrors of the timber camps in the North, things which have not been seen since the last onslaught of the Roman Empire upon Christianity; things for which the only comfort is religion and from which the only release is death.

The Five Year Plan will not succeed, but that is only because the Soviet tyrants have set themselves an impossibly great task for the time. But that is not to say that they may not ultimately, given the continued absence of active opposition, achieve that task. They have both the determination and the material. One cannot foretell what a country can do with modern machinery and a population of 160 million apathetic slaves. As Lord Snowden recently said: "There is no unemployment in Russia or in Dartmoor gaol, and for the same reason." Consider what the Roman Empire achieved on the basis of slavery with a much smaller population, and without modern machinery! If Russia achieves her plan in ten or twenty years, she may have the world at her feet unless that world in the meantime has re-organized itself.

Russia has set herself to undermine civilization, to root out Christianity, and to substitute communism and atheism. The Holy See has warned the world of these "still graver

evils that are threatening it." A recent observer has described America as a country in which "God and the devil are fighting for the soul of a people." That is true of the whole world. To-day, as the Holy Father declares in his latest Encyclical—*Caritate Christi Compulsi*—"For God or against God, this once more is the alternative which shall decide the destinies of mankind."

He warns us that—

To-day, when atheism is spreading through the masses of the people, the practical consequences of such an error become dreadfully tangible . . . in place of moral laws, which disappear together with the loss of faith in God, brute force is imposed. Belief in God is the unshaken foundation of all social order and of all responsible action on earth . . . [Failing that Faith] all moral law fails, and there is no remedy left to stop the gradual but inevitable destruction of peoples, families, the State, civilization itself.

In a very real sense we stand, where St. Augustine stood—in a crumbling world with the barbarians at the gate. But we have the advantage of his experience, and the Church is not now a small and struggling "sect, everywhere spoken against," but a strong, militant world-wide organization able, if united in charity, to withstand and defeat the gates of hell. Catholics must do their part to preserve what the Church has created—Christian civilization. The breakdown of our complicated civilization would involve a ruin far more complete, suffering far more intense, chaos far more appalling. That is why the Holy See calls so insistently upon "all those who do not want anarchy and terrorism . . . to bestir themselves."

What part are Catholics going to play in creating the New Order? If it was the Church which saved Europe in the fifth and sixth centuries, it is the Church alone which can save the world to-day in the twentieth century. The Church is 325 million strong. Her forces are present in every country. The organization of her hierarchy, holding direct Apostolic jurisdiction in each of her thousands of dioceses, yet in essential communion with her central See, is the greatest marvel of strong, efficient and flexible government that the world has ever seen. Her laity is enthusiastically faithful. The Holy Father records that "A powerful breathing of the Holy



Spirit is now passing over all the earth, drawing especially the souls of the young to the highest Christian ideals, raising them above all human respect, rendering them ready for every sacrifice even the most heroic."

Now, though the breakdown shows itself in Economics, the real roots of the crisis are moral. It is only on a basis of Christian morality that effective Co-operation can be effectively brought about, because we cannot find elsewhere any influences capable of restraining and guiding human pride and cupidity. We are bound to lose our lives if we try to save them by merely earthly means. The perversion of true religion by Calvinistic Protestantism<sup>1</sup> divorced economics from ethics and sanctioned the uncontrolled and disordered development of industrial life. Moreover, if one considers the modern evolution of the idea of the State, one cannot but note a continuous retrogression from standards of moral law and principle to standards of selfishness and expediency. This has been going on since the French Revolution,—one might even say, since the end of the thirteenth century—when nationalism, as we know it, first took shape. The later revolt of the North West of Europe from the Universal Church threw doctrine into chaos and gradually abolished, especially in national and business relations, a common standard of morality. Hence, the usurpation of those rights which the Church had safeguarded—the rights of conscience and the family—by the State, resulting in a reversion to pagan Cæsarism. Moreover, there is a subtle infection of communism spreading through the schools, especially in those provided by the State, which has no means of excluding teachers with subversive ideas. The forcing of the children of the poor into schools where no provision is made for their due education in faith and morality is a palmary instance of State tyranny, against which it is the duty of Catholics to go on protesting. How can the ideal of Economic Co-operation take hold of minds, indoctrinated, it may be, with class-hatred or with racial conceit or with low ideals of human greatness and happiness? A narrow national selfishness and a debased materialistic ideal, shut out altogether the view of human brotherhood and responsibility to a common Father that must inspire the new World-Order.

<sup>1</sup> See "Calvin and 'Big Business,'" by Bernard Dempsey, S.J., *THE MONTH*, April, 1932.

The old order took as inevitable, not only the essential hostility of nations, but the class-war, the antagonism between Capital and Labour. The need for self-protection led to the rise of Trades Unions, which, created by the oppressed, and unjustly hampered in their development by a capitalistic legislature, took from the first a belligerent character and had to maintain discipline amongst their members by coercive methods. If they had arisen in a Catholic society they might have revived the power and efficacy of the old Guilds. But their origin was Godless, save for that fierce resentment against injustice which is God's own gift, and there was no Church to guide them. They could attain their end only by strict unity, and they had no means of securing unity save that of force. On the lines of the Encyclical on Social Order, the Catholic world must try to reform all the abuses of Labour and Capital alike. An undisciplined nation can form no stable association with other nations in the economic sphere. The hope of the future lies in the presence in every nation of those who know the true principles of social reconstruction, *and in their union*. We must therefore join with our Catholic brethren everywhere, in advocating that "moderation" which is characteristic of the true Catholic spirit and which shows itself in regulating that desire for wealth, for pleasure, for dominance, which, uncontrolled, brings nation and individual alike to disaster. We are now reaping the wild oats sown by a Godless industrialism, and they offer poor sustenance. The world is reduced to prison fare. But there is all the difference to happiness between the imposed regime of prison fare and the self-imposed temperance of a Christian community. In such voluntary and cheerful simplicity, Catholics should lead.

All this means that we have got to be more content than we have been, with less possessions. Capital must be content with a lower return, and make sure that its uses, directly or indirectly, are genuinely productive. And, on its side, Labour, no longer faced by a covetous Capitalism regardless of justice and equity—and in the term Labour I include all workers, of every grade, whether with brain or brawn—must lay aside its sense of resentment and its belligerency. The Pope has suggested "vocational groupings," the old Guild idea adapted to the present day. Catholic economists should explore that possibility, so that in future there should

be opportunity given for honest work at a just wage. Wages must be regulated on the basis of partnership in the interests of employer and employed with an eye to the success of the business, not the success of one class against another. This will mean less Riviera and perhaps less Margate and Blackpool, and more development of the resources of the mind and soul which do not depend so much upon outward and material things.

A final word upon what is the ultimate source of temporal well-being—the land. The future of machinery is uncertain. As mechanical production grows more and more perfect the scope for employment in industry must decline. Therefore, there is need for a readjustment of the balance of primary and secondary production, that is between agriculture and industry. By some means or other those whom industry cannot absorb should be encouraged to go back to the land, and the land made easily available for them. The whole system of agriculture should be reorganized and intensified so that as far as possible a large section of the population should be growing their own food and living a more or less self-supporting life. Agricultural colonies, on the lines of several recent Catholic experiments, should be developed and, if necessary, supported in their early stages by the State or Municipalities.

In the autumn we shall know whether the statesmen of the world have resolutely set their faces towards the New Order—whether *i.e.*, the public opinion of their several nations will compel them so to control national selfishness and ambition as to be able to co-operate for the general welfare. Catholics, entrusted with the Talent of Faith, have a vast responsibility in the way of forming this public opinion: for if the world's affairs, economic and political, are not settled on Christian lines, they will never be settled at all.

P. MAURICE HILL.

## THE C.C.I.R. ITS NECESSITY AND ITS NEED

I SHOULD like to stress some points in a Note in the August MONTH, called "A Catholic Entente"; for the Catholic Council for International Relations is, in my opinion, one of the least known, least assisted, and most necessary societies existing in this country to-day.

It is but little known, for the sort of work it does is not what would readily be appreciated by the immense majority of English Catholics; and, indeed, much of the work is so definitely office-work, that it is hard to see what publicity could be given to it such as to make itself intelligible. The point of each of a hundred little items would have to be explained, save to people *already* "educated" enough to know about, and care about, Catholics in countries other than our own.

Hence, the mere fact that it cannot obtain much publicity accounts for its being very poorly assisted indeed: after all, one's power of publishing depends upon having money to pay for publication, unless indeed one is ready to risk a mighty gamble, which in this case would not be justifiable. But, even were a few people to finance the C.C.I.R. generously, I doubt whether even so it would find an adequate public, because, in general, Catholics in this island do not care about the sort of thing with which it is essentially concerned.

However, exactly in proportion as we begin to realize that a straight fight is already in progress between Roman Catholicism and Russian Atheism, we shall see that indifferentism is suicidal. If we are to survive, we have to get out from our trance; and it is worth remembering that no divine promise has been made that Christianity shall subsist in any one country or even continent; and there is nothing in the essential nature of the Church to prevent its dying out in Europe altogether, and surviving, and maybe magnificently thriving, in Asiatic lands alone. It would still be "Catholic"; Lhasa, were the Pope to live there, would be "Rome." I purposely put the thing in extreme terms; but I do not imagine I am being absurd or "alarmist." All the same, I must try to make it clear that I am not talking nonsense.

In any case, a society that aims (and is the only one in this

country that explicitly aims) at getting into our heads what is happening about our Faith in the world at large, is not an elegant flounce upon our religious robes, but a *necessity*.

It may be worth recalling as briefly as possible how the C.C.I.R. came into existence. After the War, I found myself trying to co-operate with those who desired to see strong Catholic societies formed among students in our Universities. The existence of a great number of such societies inevitably suggested their inter-communication, and so, almost at once, their federation. This took place, and we could write a whole article about this obscure event, and its growth and practical consequences which outstrip anything that we dreamed of.<sup>1</sup> But these consequences came about, owing to the following fact. At once it was thrust upon us that Catholic University students all over the world were animated by the same ideal as ourselves—the formation of an educated Catholic Mind issuing into adequate Catholic Action. For, if ever-increasing legions of Catholic young men and women went to Universities to get their minds formed, and found that they were being formed in every way *other than* the Catholic one, there would not be the least chance of their acting in a seriously Catholic way in adult life. With embarrassing rapidity, therefore, our Federation found itself obliged, in infancy, to associate with many other groups or Federations abroad, and to enter into a *Confederation*, which now exists and is called the “Pax Romana.”

But, having thus been forced to turn one's mind increasingly towards other countries, one could not but perceive what mutual ignorance and even misconceptions existed among Catholics. Thus, to put our end first, it was exasperating to observe that yearly visits were being paid by very enthusiastic groups of foreign students, or older people, to England, and that *never* were these visitors welcomed by any Catholic organization; so that, albeit such groups were, very often, Catholics, they returned to France, to Germany, to Peru, having seen nothing whatsoever of Catholic life here, and unaware that Catholics so much as existed in England. Similarly, English institutions were constantly organizing visits of intelligent people to foreign countries: save by exception, these were met, sedulously waited on, and shepherded

<sup>1</sup> I would gladly forward to anyone interested the Report of the last Annual General Meeting of our University Federation, Liverpool, March, 1932: one shilling. It adequately covers the ground, home and foreign.—C.C.M.

around, by organizations which showed them nothing of Catholic life in the lands they went to. This might be because *either* the hosts were not Catholic at all, and did not want them to see Catholic things; or, they were Catholics, but did not guess that members of the invading group themselves were Catholic, and so displayed "tact," and wanted them to feel at home, and to interest themselves in the social or political state of the recipient country without being "put off" by evidence of an alien religion; or again, were not themselves sufficiently well educated as Catholics, to see the point of the Faith and its civilizing rôle. (You could hardly have expected them to preach sermons to, *e.g.*, a group of Finnish boy scouts on the *spiritual* value of Catholicism.)

Hence, when it was suggested that a society should be formed which would draw the links closer between us and our fellow-Catholics abroad, and on a wider scale than Universities offered, many people here were delighted. The development of an educated, homogeneous Catholic mind among all peoples was foreseen. Several persons joined in creating this society, notably a young and very active convert, who had had much experience in Belgium during and after the War, and was evidently the man to increase his own contact with, and put us stay-at-homes in contact with, Catholics and their problems abroad. The new "Catholic Council for International Relations" was given (I thought) a grandiloquent name; and was divided into many committees with duties largely intellectual—to examine Catholic principles in regard of peace and war, of minorities, of languages and so forth—which appeared to me far beyond their powers. For few people in England had qualities or even time for addressing themselves to these large subjects. Personally, I would have liked the C.C.I.R. to confine itself to making known—by means of lantern lectures—what foreign Catholics were doing and suffering and hoping for, to British audiences who, I found by experience, were ready to be very interested and who were always surprised. And correspondingly, I would have liked us to make a point of learning Catholic facts when we travelled, and so, to be put into touch with foreign societies, and also to tell them facts about English Catholics. This was done, up to a certain point, though not nearly enough: but so much else was ambitioned that, when the history of the C.C.I.R. seemed to be on the whole a drawing-in of its horns, ending up, last year, with the abolition of a great many of its departments, it

looked as if the whole society were dying out, and I have found quite a number of people who thought that it was dead.

But by no means. To show this, I will outline a *small part* of what its desperately overworked, underpaid officials have done between last November and July.

The Disarmament Conference was begun last February. Catholics ought at least to know on what principles they should base their attitude to the subject. The best way of supplying them with the facts, was to collect a series of statements made by the Sovereign Pontiffs during the last century or so. This document was drawn up: it was approved by His Eminence Cardinal Bourne; adhered to by the Catholic Union of International Studies (Irish Branch) and the Catholic Association for International Peace (U.S.A.). It was "released" at a public meeting in London in November, 1931, and simultaneously broadcast by the ever-generous B.B.C. It received, naturally, full publicity in the Catholic Press of this country, but also in many non-Catholic papers; and it appeared practically in full in the *Osservatore Romano*, and in the Catholic and general Press of France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Jugo-Slavia, Czechoslovakia, Malta, Australia, Belgium, Spain, Ireland and the U.S.A. Hence no English Catholic can possibly pretend that the ideas of successive Pontiffs have not been made accessible to him: if he has not read or listened-in about them, or will not form his mind and heart according to them, or is just indifferent to them, he has condemned himself in various degrees, of apathy, or disloyalty. This is serious.

Further, during an international Catholic demonstration held in Geneva during the Disarmament Conference, Mr. J. Eppstein, alluded to above, the Hon. Foreign Correspondence Secretary of the C.C.I.R., addressed that meeting as the C.C.I.R. official representative, using the Statement as his text. This speech appeared in the collection of addresses then given, published in German and French by the "Union Catholique d'Etudes Internationales."

A word about this Union, of which the C.C.I.R. is the English Branch. Its headquarters are at Fribourg in Switzerland, and it exists in order to study international questions in the light of Catholic principles. It groups together Catholics of eminence in every land, who have specialized in the legal, economic, historical or philosophical aspects of such questions. It represents and defends the Catholic view (for



such a view exists) in international organizations and especially in the varied work of the League of Nations.

Here are some examples of the kind of co-operation that can exist between the C.C.I.R. and the U.C.I.E.

In 1930, the U.C.I.E., assisted by the C.C.I.R., produced a memorandum upon Forced Labour in the light of Catholic principles and presented it to the International Labour Conference. The memorandum had a marked effect on the deliberations of that body. It was proposed to take similar action about the allied subject of Long Term Labour-contracts, should occasion arise and the action appear suitable. The International Labour Organization of the League of Nations considered the advisability of holding an international convention for the better protection of children in non-industrial professions, especially as regards age of admission. The protection of children has always been an essential part of any Catholic social programme; so, should the convention be held, the C.C.I.R. will undoubtedly have the duty of forwarding to the U.C.I.E. an exhaustive statement about this question, in so far as it affects this country. The question of traffic in dangerous drugs also arose. In June and July an international conference dealing with the Teaching of History was held at the Hague: the U.C.I.E. arranged for the due representation of Catholic views at this conference, and, so far as England was concerned, made use of authoritative information entirely collected and supplied through the C.C.I.R.<sup>1</sup>

Another different sort and channel of activity. The organization of Charity in Germany is well-known. Full information about Catholic social work in England was forwarded to the "Caritas Catholica" there, with information about the possible representation of England at the international conference on social work which is being planned. France, Czechoslovakia and especially Hungary have written about what always creates real bewilderment on the Continent—the fact that Catholics in these islands are free to belong to the Labour Party, professedly "socialist," whereas it is impossible for a practising Catholic to belong to what is always meant by "socialist" parties abroad. Full information was, of course, sent; and I would wish to interpolate a line explain-

<sup>1</sup> Curiously enough, I have just heard to-day that a non-Catholic University professor in the U.S.A. is so shocked by the unfairness of the way in which the history of the Church is presented even in the Universities, that he desires the inclusion of a *course* of lectures in Catholic history, in the summer curriculum, if not always.

ing why I think this information may prove exceptionally valuable.

The most "conservative" party is, to-day, "socialist" compared with what our fathers meant by "conservative." Probably all the world will presently be what we now call "labour," in so far as it is not revolutionary in the Russian sense. For, to the Russian mind, what we call "labour" and half of what the Continent calls "socialist" is altogether reactionary, is derided and denounced. What Russia is constructing within herself is well-known on its economic side; probably it is far less well-known on its philosophic side,<sup>1</sup> and hardly at all from the anti-religious side. For the "atheism" we intermittently hear about, is an essential product of that social philosophy, and is to be preached and *imposed* as such; toleration is itself not to be tolerated; free-thought is scorned, and its relation to Russian atheism is just that of our largely Labour pacifism to the "violent" revolution that Russia desires to bring to pass. Hence, I think that England can play a real part in foreign countries by explaining how all the constructive ideals in Labour parties, be they dubbed "socialist" or not, can be made perfectly good use of by Catholics, and themselves would be enormously purified and strengthened by an alliance with Catholic principles. Foreign countries, it seems to me, either will have to go Bolshevik in the Russian sense; or they will have to effect an alliance between Catholics and all the non-Russian elements in any of their parties whatsoever. England *may* provide not a little guidance herein. At present, it is the scrupulously orthodox C.C.I.R. and the C.S.G. which are giving information about our own position here.

Besides this, the C.C.I.R. recently put a solid weapon into the hands of Spanish Catholics by giving them the information they asked for about freedom of Catholic schools here: our Catholic "Institute of Higher Studies" has aroused definitely more interest in, *e.g.*, Switzerland, than it has in England; the German International Catholic Radio Office has been put into touch with a Catholic radio expert in this country; Rio de Janeiro is anxious to form a society on similar lines and applied for information about the C.C.I.R.; from independent sources many applications have come for a closer relation between German and English Catholics; biblio-

<sup>1</sup> We hope that M. Gurian's book, "Bolshevism, Theory and Practice" (Sheed & Ward), will have a great sale amongst us, for it is almost the only book in England that really does explain the true Russian outlook and experiment.

graphy and documentation have been sent to Italy, France and the U.S.A. on the subject of the Church and international ethics; and the "Royal Institute of International Affairs" (Chatham House, St. James' Square) has more than once asked for the co-operation of the C.C.I.R., and has obtained from it a great deal of information, and also a speaker, upon the relations between State and Church in Italy.

It has, moreover, organized lecture-debates, upon subjects like "Catholicism and the British Empire" (Mr. Douglas Woodruff); "Proletarians or Slaves" (Mr. R. O'Sullivan): and lectures, of which one set was exactly what I would have always hoped for—on "Jugo-Slavia, A Bridge for Reunion" (Miss A. Christitch); "Russia, A Social Experiment" (Count G. Bennigsen); "Germany of To-day" (Mr. M. Neven du Mont); "Portugal the Pioneer" (Prof. E. Prestage); and "Has the League of Nations any Real Authority?" (Mr. J. Eppstein). It circulates a very varied lecture list, and Corporate Associates (see below) have the right to one free lecture annually, and these do a very good and widening, though quiet, work in schools. The list would be forwarded on request. A Catholic Monthly Letter supplies British news of Catholic importance to no less than 14 other countries; two prizes are offered for the best essays sent in from Training Colleges on subjects assigned, along with which a full bibliography is sent to entrant colleges. In London, periodical luncheons are arranged, at which some distinguished guest makes a brief speech upon his country and its Catholic prospects.

But perhaps the widest-reaching and far the most obscure activity of the C.C.I.R. consists in its immense correspondence and in the hospitality given by its office to foreign guests. Recently, *within a few hours*, it received visitors from Spain, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, the U.S.A. and S. Africa, all seeking for information about Catholic things here. To it, letters are addressed from all over the world. I turn over to it half—the more annoying half requiring detailed information or research—of my foreign letters, and on its side it can hand over everything directly connected with University students (who come in shoals to England to learn English and need domiciles) to the University Federation, which has had to divide up its foreign correspondence between *two* secretaries, willing to cope with anything in German, and the rest, respectively. To-day, I am

having to send to the C.C.I.R. an exhaustive questionnaire about our Press, Catholic and other, sent by an Austrian priest; and a very malicious article in a much-read weekly about the alleged persecution of the Orthodox in Poland; and on its side the C.C.I.R. has addressed to me a very intelligent young German, a leader in Catholic youth-movements in his land. And I have to reserve a mass of Dutch literature and photos that have also come to-day. But I expect they will re-lapse into the C.C.I.R. archives.

I have certainly said enough to make an end of any idea that the C.C.I.R. is doing no work—that it can do so much is due to the indefatigable energy of Mr. V. Fowke, its Hon. Secretary, and his absolutely invaluable assistant, Miss Fox, whose accuracy, alertness and perseverance are beyond praise. I can only hope that I have also convinced readers of the importance of that work. It was long ago said that *all* problems are to-day international ones. It was also often said that Nationalism was the next heresy for Rome to condemn. But the position has already been altered. It is now obvious to the world that Russia inflames savage nationalist passions wherever she can, in order thus to produce that preliminary chaos which she believes will make a good foundation for her atheist edifice projected everywhere. I would have preferred that the C.C.I.R. should have won its way among Catholics just upon Catholic principles as such, and not have to expect that people will more and more see its point because they are frightened. But frightened they now are, as they see the things they have been accustomed to falling into ruins round them, and that their law of cohesion seems to be lost, and that there is one very coherent force at work not only in all countries separately, but interconnectedly, and that it is never alluded to by our statesmen; frantically resisted, when they fear for their pockets, but readily co-operated with when it is likely to pay (Russian timber) by our men of commerce and, no doubt, world-financiers; and is practically misconceived by average folks, who think of Russia as “very dreadful” because of the carnage and cruelty there of which they have sometimes heard, and “terrible” because they have also heard that it persecutes Christians, though they don’t really quite believe that. In other words, a polarization is taking place around Moscow, and also around Rome; the one thing we dare not do is to add ourselves to the mass of the indifferent, the best servants of any determined minority, save that other

mass of the miserable. Apathy and Misery : here are the two facts that make Bolshevism possible ; and its increasing success probable.

The C.C.I.R. has a small, but harassing, debt. It will probably be paid off without too much difficulty ; but it will recur, because, as must be obvious, expenses in postage alone are heavy ; salaries must continue to be paid ; and subscriptions are quite inadequate to do even this properly. This supremely important society has, therefore, to lead the hand-to-mouth existence too easily accepted by so many Catholic societies. For my part, I have frankly told it that I am anxious to create for it—or rather to assist in creating—a small but untouchable capital, say, of £5,000, which would produce an income insufficient for comfort or even perfect efficiency, but would make an incalculable difference, and incidentally admit of the C.C.I.R.'s gaining proper publicity. Yet it certainly will not become a "popular" society—perhaps ever, and anyway not soon. Hence, while it would willingly accumulate small sums, as most of our societies have to do, I feel convinced that it *ought* to receive a few large gifts, and in spite of all that is said about depression, the thing is possible. And if we are consciously to co-operate to bringing about "Pax Christi in Regno Christi," I feel no doubt at all but that it is through the agency of this society that our united work will have to be done.<sup>1</sup>

C. C. MARTINDALE.

<sup>1</sup> Enquiries could be addressed to me, 114, Mount Street, London, W.1 ; or, Hon. Sec., C.C.I.R., 72-74, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1.

## SCIENCE AND CAUSALITY

THE stir recently caused in English Protestantism by the speculations of Professors Jeans and Eddington is another example of what may be described in the current jargon as "the inferiority complex." This has long been a feature of popular theology in this country. There seems to be a tacit assumption that religion should be very grateful for any crumbs that fall from the intellectually rich man's table. With this feeling goes a disinclination to examine too critically whether the crumbs are real bread or not. One may reasonably doubt whether the remarkable aberrations of Bishop Barnes in matters of theology would be considered to fall within the wide limits even of Anglican "comprehensiveness" but for the irrelevant fact that he is a fine mathematician and holds a doctorate of science.

When Darwinism burst upon an astonished world at the end of the eighteen-fifties, it moved Protestant divines to a fury which the Catholic Church, with her fuller appreciation of the respective spheres of science and religion, naturally did not emulate. Providentially, the translators of the authorized version had rendered *γνώσις* in I Timothy vi. 20 by the word "Science" and it would be difficult to estimate how many Protestant churches rang with denunciations of "Science, falsely so-called." This defiant attitude, however, was short-lived. Even in the lifetime of Huxley, the doctrine of the survival of the fittest had been sentimentalized into a totally different doctrine of the survival of the best and the Darwinian scriptures became canonical at Pleasant Sunday Afternoon gatherings where the Pentateuch had "none so poor to do it reverence."

More recently, Professor Bergson came to the rescue of English Christianity. This Hebrew philosopher, one was almost led to believe, had come to save religion when the Hebrew prophets were bankrupt. The Catholic murmured *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, for Bergson, no less than Kant, struck at the root of the whole intellectual argument for Christianity. "Thinking is difficult," Dean Inge has commented, "how pleasant to be told that it is mainly waste of time!" The Dean of St. Paul's may surely be forgiven much for that!

It was hardly to be expected after this that popular Protestantism would examine in any hostile spirit a free gift from the popular scientists of the moment, in the shape of an argument against the determinists. Nothing has more worried its professors than the doctrine of free-will. A considerable section of the Protestant world, in days when its theological consciousness was more active than it is to-day, had succumbed to determinism in the form of Calvinist doctrine. The scientific variety, however, has always been recognized as a danger. Robert Blatchford's "Defence of the Bottom Dog," on the eve of the "new theology" controversy, was the occasion of almost the last serious offensive by English Protestantism, and its protagonists appeared half-conscious that they were fighting a losing battle. Kant's appeal to the "Practical Reason" was the best they could do, and it was a poor best.

Imagine, then, the excitement when Professor Eddington told every possessor of a wireless receiving apparatus that determinism was unscientific! "Another striking change," he said, "is in regard to determinism . . . So far as we have yet gone in our probing of the material universe, we cannot find a particle of evidence in favour of determinism." Sir James Jeans declares that the new science, "cuts away the ground on which the old determinism was based." Who, in such circumstances, could object to the baptism of Professors Eddington and Jeans? Alas! it seems to have escaped the observation of all the well-intentioned reverend gentlemen, that the physicists in disposing of determinism, sought to dispose also of the principle of causality. It very much understates the case to say, in the expressive vulgarism, that they have emptied out the baby with the bath!

As a matter of fact, however, there is quite manifestly a faulty sense of proportion in the popular response to Jeans and Eddington. What does the New Physics amount to? It consists of certain speculations on the ultimate composition of the atom. Let me insist on *speculations*, for not only are we not dealing with observations, but the new physicists are most anxious to insist that the subjects with which they deal never can be the subject of observation. The joke about the number of angels that can stand on the point of a needle entirely lost its own point when the new metaphysico-mathematicians began their speculations on the atom, for, while it may be questioned by some whether any man has ever seen an angel, it is beyond all dispute that nobody ever has seen or ever will see



a proton or an electron, however powerful his microscope. Why, therefore, should it be assumed that the *speculations* of the physicist have more bearing on the question of human free-will than the *observations* of the biologist? "The contribution of physics to the problem of human free-will," writes one competent authority, "seems to me to remain what it has always been—namely, nothing at all."<sup>1</sup> The same writer adds very pertinently: "If any argument from analogy is valid in this matter, it should presumably be drawn from the *macroscopic* equations of physics, because all known forms of life are polyatomic." If we sell our metaphysical birthright for a physical demonstration of free-will we shall find ourselves fobbed off with a very unsatisfying mess of pottage.

Even if we could accept the conclusions of the New Physics as destructive of determinism, the gift would be dearly purchased at the price of the principle of causality, in view of the intimate connection between that principle and the proofs of the existence of God. Perhaps it will be convenient at this point to explain that, by the principle of causality, I mean the doctrine that whatever does not exist by necessity—whatever, in other words, might not exist—owes its existence to some thing or things other than itself, which other thing or things may properly be called its cause. We may analyse this conception into material, formal, efficient and final causes, and it may be more convenient in some cases to talk of "an aetiological chain." In any case, the causal principle must be retained as a necessity of philosophical thought. It is not a hypothesis, like that of the existence of the ether, which may conceivably be untrue but useful for purposes of co-ordinating knowledge and acquiring fresh knowledge. On the contrary, it must be true, though it may be convenient to ignore it in framing hypotheses. In other words, there is always an answer to the question, "Why?" though sometimes we may not know it and at others it may not be worth while to look for it.

Keen criticisms of the validity and the efficacy of this principle in proving the existence of an uncaused First Cause are not new. The most vivacious with which I am acquainted is that of Schopenhauer, who accuses theologians of treating the principle of causality like a hired cab, to be dismissed

<sup>1</sup> "Science and Human Experience," by Professor H. Dingle, D.Sc. (London, 1932), p. 89.

when we have reached our destination.<sup>1</sup> This, like so much in Schopenhauer, is more witty than profound, but the pessimistic philosopher, whatever he thought about the application of the law, recognized its validity in relation to phenomena. Perversely he extended it further in order to prove the non-existence of God! More damaging is the line of thought which denies the principle itself. If causality goes, there goes with it the whole superstructure of philosophical proofs of the existence of God. We are thrown back upon intuitionism, the "varieties of religious experience," *et hoc genus omne*. The issues are grave.

Hume's criticism of causality is well-known. He attempted to resolve the conception into a perception of invariable sequence. It is easy to answer that, on this basis, day becomes the cause of night and Monday of Tuesday. No attempt to explain causality in terms of anything simpler than itself has ever been successful.

The important question is this: Is the idea of Cause derived from experience or is it prior to experience? To ask whether Cause is to be considered a transcendental is to recognize once more the difficulties of philosophical terminology even among those whose general outlook is the same. "This causal principle," writes Dr. Vance, "is in no sense transcendental."<sup>2</sup> If we turn to the "Catholic Encyclopædia," we read: "Strictly speaking, cause, being a transcendental, cannot receive a logical definition."<sup>3</sup> Let us stick, therefore, to the question whether the conception of causality is dependent on experience, as, for example, the idea of gravitation unquestionably is.

The answer of common sense, if not conclusive, is quite clear and it is very well illustrated in connexion with this idea of gravitation which may seem, at first blush, to share the universality of the belief in cause and effect. "Tell the plain man that a heavy object has spontaneously moved upwards instead of downwards and he may well be sceptical. It will not, however, make the sort of nonsense to him that would be conveyed by a statement that an event is uncaused. The causal idea (to speak loosely) extends beyond humanity. Let a dog hear a noise and he will look round to see where it has come from. Place a kitten in front of a mirror and, after

<sup>1</sup> "The Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason," by A. Schopenhauer (English translation, 1889), p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> "Reality and Truth," by Dr. J. G. Vance (London, 1917), p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> "Catholic Encyclopædia," Vol. III., art. "Cause."

pawing it, he will walk behind to see what is *causing* the apparition. Who has not been puzzled by the exaggerated "causality consciousness" of the small child? "Daddy, what is that?" "A cow." "Why?"

In spite of this, it is seriously maintained to-day that causality is a product of experience, with the natural corollary that there are conceivable areas of experience in which it does not apply. It is urged, notably, that modern physics is dealing with precisely such an area. The case was put to me in conversation by a physicist recently. "You may say," he argued, "that if you take one from two, only one will remain. That may be stated as a universal law. But you have two ideas and you give me one. You still have two left. It is clear, therefore, that there is an order of experience in which that law does not apply. It is the same with cause. We have found, in our study of the atom, a sphere into which the cause-and-effect relation does not enter. We have no more right to intrude it into that sphere than we should have to apply the laws of subtraction to the commerce of ideas."

This argument would, of course, be wholly unconvincing if it were advanced to challenge the proposition: "Take one from two and one remains," because it is clear that in the first case there is subtraction and in the second sharing. As I understand the contention, it is that, just as an arithmetical proposition is out of place in discussing the interchange of ideas, so the causal principle is out of its field in atomic physics—not merely unnecessary to science, but inapplicable.

Can we admit this reasoning? If our conception of cause be derived from experience, there is no escape. But could it be seriously argued that, before the quantum theory and the Principle of Indeterminacy, we could assign a cause to every event? The scope of the law has always been assumed by plain people to be vastly greater than any evidence for it. To say: "I do not know," has never been considered an absurd answer to the question: "What caused this?" To answer: "There is no cause," would be so considered. This attitude of commonsense cannot be better expressed than in the words of Mill:

For every event there exists some combination of objects and events, some given concurrence of circumstances, positive and negative, the occurrence of which will always be followed by that phenomenon. We may not have found out what this concurrence of circumstances may be; but

we never doubt that there is such a one, and that it never occurs without having the phenomenon in question as its cause or consequence.<sup>1</sup>

Is there anything in modern science to shake this view? Can there be? It is quite legitimate to point out, that the principle of sufficient reason is the logical equivalent of the law of causality and cannot be discussed without admitting it. What is the object of an argument? To prove that there is (or is not) sufficient reason for holding an opinion. The implication is that it is requisite that there should be.

I am assured by a mathematical physicist, whose authority on the subject cannot be questioned, that the quantum theory discussion itself implies an acceptance of causality. That is a question on which I am not entitled to an opinion, though I note that no less an authority than the great Planck in his recent Guthrie lecture leans to a belief in the principle.<sup>2</sup> I am content, however, to assume that this discussion can be carried on without relation to the cause-and-effect relation. This is less extreme than the claim of Professor Dingle that "the notion of 'cause' has no place in Science."<sup>3</sup>

Does this mean that the events studied by Science as a whole or in any part of it are uncaused? Not in the least. It merely means that, for certain limited purposes, Cause may be left out of account. To deny this distinction implies an extreme form of idealism which is philosophically untenable. A navigator, *qua* navigator, ignores the chemical composition of the sea. Is it, therefore, non-existent? To jump from the relevance or irrelevance of causation to the physicist to its non-existence for the philosopher would, of course, be absurd. The matter, however, does not end there. A New Physicist may say: "Causality exists for the philosopher, but not for me." Similarly, the cook may say: "Sodium and chlorine exist for the chemist, but only table salt for me." At this point the need for a sane realism becomes urgent. The truth is that they exist, and we must not talk of their *existence* for this person or the other, but only of their *relevance* to his practical or theoretical purposes.

But the denial of causality has become fashionable and it has spread from the physicist to the physician. I have previously had occasion to write in *THE MONTH*<sup>4</sup> on the specula-

<sup>1</sup> Mill's "Logic" (Second Edition, 1846), Vol. I., p. 398.

<sup>2</sup> *Nature*, July 9, 1932.

<sup>3</sup> *Science and Human Experience*, p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> See *THE MONTH* for July, 1931: "An English Critic of Thomism."

tions of Dr. Crookshank on this point. Another distinguished physician, Dr. A. P. Cawadias, is fond of dismissing what he calls "the old causality principle." Now, in relation to medicine, however it may be with atomic physics, it would be absurd, over the greater part of the field, to assume even that causality can be irrelevant. Would any doctor assume that diphtheria was uncaused? What about the drains?

When we are told that "the notion of causation as generally understood in England to-day makes no appeal to the Chinese mind,"<sup>1</sup> it is necessary to deny it emphatically and there is no need to go to China to do so. In support of this contention, I have been told that when a visitor remarked to a Chinese that it was bad weather, he replied: "Yes, it has been so since the new Government came into power." But this precisely disproves the claim. The relation which the Chinese wished to establish between the new Government and the weather was, "the notion of causality as generally understood in England"—and everywhere else. What differed was the notion of what constitutes a likely cause—an entirely separate thing. Without the notion of causality any discussion becomes gibberish and there is no such thing as a *non-sequitur*.

To argue for the validity and necessity of the causal principle is not to say that it is as easy as one could wish to give a philosophical defence of it. The first reaction against Hume came from the common-sense school, and when the writer in the "Catholic Encyclopædia" tells us that the notion "cannot receive a logical definition," it is clear that we must not pitch our hopes too high. A very interesting defence is undertaken by Dr. Vance in his book, "Reality and Truth," already cited. I have to confess diffidently to finding it less compelling than the rest of that excellent book. Dr. Vance, too, begins with the appeal to common sense. If, he tells us, the papers begin to fly about the room, we look for a cause.<sup>2</sup> But he proceeds to a more rational justification. The principle of causality is stated in these terms: "A change of any kind whatsoever requires the operation or co-operation of some extrinsic force, agent or stimulus." Understood in this way, the principle is of limited application, for, as the author adds: "it may be that there are disembodied spirits

<sup>1</sup> "Individual Psychology and the Bases of Science," by Dr. F. G. Crookshank, in *Psyche*, January, 1931, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 101-113.

not subject to change, and, it is certain, as is proved in another branch of philosophy, that the First Cause is immutable." One is led to question this definition. If there be immutable disembodied spirits, is it correct to call them uncaused? The Supreme Being certainly is uncaused, but He is Cause. It would seem, therefore, that both are related to the Principle of Causality. The next stage in Dr. Vance's argument is a claim that the Principle of Contradiction depends upon the Principle of Causality. If so, will not their areas be conterminous? Where the Law of Causality does not apply, will not the Principle of Contradiction be found unsupported? Yet it is hard to argue that the First Cause and the hypothetical immutable spirits are outside the Principle of Contradiction.

The argument for the interdependence of the two principles is, briefly, that, if we deny the Principle of Causality, a thing may be both potential and actual, or, in other words, may be actual and non-actual, which would deny the Principle of Contradiction. How shall we state that principle? It is clearly insufficient to say: "A thing cannot both be and not be." Dr. Vance anticipates the objection of a critic. "You have throughout the whole discussion," he makes him say, "ignored the factor of time. The Principle of Contradiction ought to be stated in the form 'that a thing cannot both be and not be *at one and the same time*.' This is the simple truth which ruins your whole nexus between this principle and the causal law."

Is this objection effectively answered? I cannot persuade myself that it is. True, Dr. Vance discovers the weak point of his critic. It is not sufficient to introduce the factor of time, if we ignore that of modality. "Brandy, for instance, may at one and the same time be food for an invalid and poison for a dipsomaniac." Dr. Vance's conclusion is that when we say "a thing" we must add: "viewed formally as the same." Agreed! But is this any more sufficient? Does not a full statement of the Principle of Contradiction require both the temporal and the modal factors? Dr. Vance thinks not. "The factor of 'time' must be eliminated." That is not the view of M. Maritain. He states the Principle of Contradiction in this form: "Il est impossible qu'une même chose soit et ne soit pas *en même temps* et sous le même rapport."<sup>1</sup> To take the example already given, the brandy,

<sup>1</sup> "Petite Logique" (Paris, 1923), p. 194.

which is food for the invalid at one time, may be poison to the same invalid at another time.

In reply it may perhaps be urged that there never is the same invalid at another time. If time is *numerus motus* it is arguable that the factor of time can be resolved into that of modality. Just as I am conscious that my own attitude towards causality may seem to lean dangerously towards pragmatism, so I feel that this retort points in the direction of the *πάντα ῥεῖ* of Heraclitus and modern philosophies of "becoming." The distinction between a change of being and a change of modality is rather subtle, and, in spite of the argument, scientists will be found to challenge causality, while admitting the Principle of Contradiction to be axiomatic. I have previously had occasion to quote the distinction between Newton's *observation* of facts and his *postulate* of force. "Force in the Newtonian sense, is not a thing observed: it is a hypothesis."<sup>1</sup> I have a feeling that Dr. Vance himself has allowed the conception of time to elude his vigilance. "The state of potentiality, *while* it remains such," he writes, "excludes the state of actuality." What is the meaning of "while"?

These remarks do not profess to be more than a note on causality, expressing perhaps more difficulties than conclusions. If I may venture to summarize the conclusions to which they seem to point, they are: (i) That nothing in modern scientific speculation or discovery has shaken, or could conceivably shake, the Principle of Causality; (ii) That it is questionable whether any strictly logical defence of that principle is possible. When physicists and physicians talk of discarding this principle, we are entitled to reflect with M. Jacques Maritain: "C'est une chose redoutable pour une civilisation d'avoir des savants privés de bon sens."<sup>2</sup>

REGINALD J. DINGLE.

<sup>1</sup> "Relativity for All," by Professor H. Dingle (London, 1922), p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> "Réflexions sur l'Intelligence" (Paris, 1926), p. 259.



## THE MASS BOOK

**A**N excellent little book has been written on the Missal with the title, "God's Wonder Book," and the title is not in the least exaggerated. The Missal does indeed contain ever new wonders for those who use it and learn to appreciate it. The difficulty is that so few Catholics do know it. As Edmund Bishop has said:

Where the sacred liturgy is concerned, Catholics are for the most part content to take, in an even, not to say indifferent, spirit, the good that comes to them, without enquiring too particularly how it came. They are content in a general way with the fact that they are in the current and stream of an uninterrupted tradition, the source of which is to be found in the apostolic age itself. Still it should be even for them a subject of interest to ascertain in some measure the steps by which the Mass book in use to-day came to be what it is; and to trace the gradual accretions that have gathered round the primitive kernel.<sup>1</sup>

Catholics see the Missal on the altar every time they attend Mass, but, then, it is as familiar to them as the altar itself. Very few realize that a volume which seems exclusively reserved for priests, is equally their own to use. It is more; it is part of their inheritance, of their right.

Of course, this complaint must not be taken too absolutely as meaning that the liturgy of the Mass is wholly neglected to-day. Nothing could be further from the truth, as will be shown. But it is certain that we need to pause from time to time and to review our privileges lest familiarity dull our appreciation. The multiplication of private prayer books has without doubt led to a more subjective and individual kind of worship which has overshadowed the more ancient and objective and authentic worship, expressed in the liturgy of the Church. Our own generation has been reminded of this by the call of Pius X. for a return to liturgical worship, and the present Holy Father has repeated the call, and has, moreover, emphasized it by making himself the head of the very definite liturgical movement which is steadily growing in popularity

<sup>1</sup> "Liturgica Historica," p. 39.

on the Continent, in the United States, and, to a less degree, in England. The names of Gueranger, Duchesne, Bishop, Fortescue, and, in our own day, those of Abbot Cabrol and Dom Lefebvre are well known, and the rich stores of learning of these scholars has been placed unreservedly at the service of the movement. In Belgium and Holland, the "Liturgical Weeks" are an annual event, and it is remarkable that most of those who take part are layfolk. At the Liturgical Congress, held in Portugal in 1928, the Catholic Young Men's Association shared in all the liturgical services in the churches with the greatest enthusiasm and appreciation. Mention should also be made of the International Liturgical Congresses such as those held at Antwerp. There has grown up also a vast literature on the subject, and reviews and magazines, ably written and attractively produced, are abundant. The periodical, *Orate Fratres*, published by the American Benedictines at St. John's Abbey, Minnesota, is an excellent example of the kind. But the most outstanding instance of liturgical study and enterprise is to be found in the work of the Benedictines of the Abbey of St. André by Bruges. Naturally enough, the best efforts of the liturgical movement have centred round the Missal, the liturgical prayer book of the Church.

It should never be forgotten that the Missal is nothing less than the record of the Church's devotion at Holy Mass, a treasury of devotion to which the ages have made, and still from time to time make, additions. Just as the Church, led by the light of faith, has built up from the "natural" truths the most perfect and satisfying philosophy that mankind has ever known, and as from Gospel revelation and the prayerful studies of devoted men she has fashioned the sublime theology of the Summa, so, too, the simple prayers of thanksgiving that rose round the first Christian altar have grown into a liturgy of surprising beauty and power. Here lies the deepest religious significance of the Missal. "Embracing in itself," as a modern writer has said, "the results of the best and most profound experiences with God, the words of the most favoured and the greatest men of prayer, the liturgy contains prayers portraying a most clear-sighted comprehension of God, as also the purest aspirations of Man towards his Creator." This in itself is reason enough why we should be glad to know more of the Missal and how it came to be the treasury of devotion that it is.

We do not know that the apostles began with any fixed ceremonial or ritual in the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. It seems indeed certain that they had no such ritual, nor should we expect to find it so early. They were commissioned to take bread and wine, offer, consecrate, and communicate it, according to the simple command of Christ. That is all that the Mass is in its essentials. But the faithful soon began to surround this brief Eucharistic Act with spontaneous expressions of their devotion. It was, first of all, natural that they should read part of the Scriptures, since the reading of the sacred books had been an important part of the Jewish liturgy to which most of them had been accustomed. It was natural also that the letters of instruction sent by the apostles should be read again and again. The psalms also would surely be sung, and so on. We can only conjecture how exactly all this would be done, but soon the necessity of some measure of order and unity would have made itself felt, particularly in the churches where Rome, with its genius for law, held sway. It is surprising to find how much had been achieved in the way of a fixed form of worship, even as early as the days of St. Justin, about the year 150, and by the time of St. Augustine the Eucharistic liturgy was sufficiently uniform to be referred to as something recognizable by the writers of the time. The unknown writer of the "*De Sacramentis*" about the year 400 shows that the more important parts of the Roman Canon, as we know it to-day, were already fixed.

The Missal is not, however, the development of a single book, but rather an amalgamation of the different service-books. In the early centuries there was no Low Mass as we know it now. The liturgy was always performed in a solemn manner with the assistance of a choir and deacons and subdeacons. Consequently, it was found more convenient to have the different parts in separate books, especially at a time when everything had to be written out by hand with great labour and expense. Thus that used by the priest at the altar contained only those parts which it was necessary for him to say, notably the Canon and the collects. It was known as the "*Sacramentary*," and was often called the "*comes*," or companion of the priest at the altar. The Introit, Gradual, Communion, etc., sung by the choir or "*schola cantorum*," were to be found in the "*Gradual*" or "*Antiphoner*," while the Epistles and Gospels were collected in another book known as the "*Lectionary*."

In addition, there existed many books of ceremonial directions known as "Ordines," the most famous of these being the first Roman Ordo, which describes a solemn Mass celebrated in Rome by the Pope or his deputy. According to Dr. Atchley, it was drawn up c. 770 by Pope Stephen III., but founded upon a similar document of the sixth century. The astonishing fact is that it contains nearly all the detailed prayers and ceremonies to which we are accustomed.

Towards the end of the eighth century, the Emperor Charlemagne asked Pope Hadrian to send him the Sacramentary of Pope Gregory. This must be regarded as an event of the first importance, for Charlemagne then held sway over the whole of the Holy Roman Empire. He was extremely zealous for the spread of the Faith in all its purity, and it looked as if his authority would aid in spreading the Roman rite in all its sober simplicity through the whole of his Dominions, and thus the Sacramentary would become the recognized Mass book of the Christian world. But it happened that the Sacramentary when it arrived did not please the Emperor. It was, to his mind, too simple, too restrained to suit the Frankish taste, which was inclined to a more florid ceremonial. Accordingly, he gave to the holy and learned Alcuin the task of enlarging the Sacramentary and of enriching it with the elements more aptly expressive of the devotion of Charlemagne and his people. Fortunately, Alcuin was a scholar of discernment, and he treated the book with a reverent hand. He left it as it stood and merely added a second part which embraced all that was the best in the different liturgies of the Western Church, gathered, so the compiler remarks, "like the spring flowers of the meadows," and, very wisely, he introduced much that had belonged to the ancient Gelasian Sacramentary. But the unexpected can happen to books as to everything else and, as Abbot Cabrol remarked of the Missal, "the destiny of this particular book was of the strangest." As time went on, the division between the two books, so carefully indicated by Alcuin, was ignored by the copyists, and the different parts were so fused together that by the tenth century they became a single book, in which the Gallic elements predominated, to form our present Missal. Indeed, it could hardly be expected that Alcuin's division should be kept. As Bishop justly observes, "practical requirements felt by all prevailed over a pious scruple, and the

various items of the Supplement were inserted at the most convenient places in the original book."<sup>1</sup>

But a more marked development came about when the custom arose, as it was bound to do, of saying private, or Low, Masses. Then the priest had to say for himself all those parts which had formerly been said by the choir and other assistants. Thus arose the "Plenary Missals" containing all the parts of the Mass without exception, and here we have the true ancestor of our modern Missal.

We have to remember that these Missals were not turned off in their thousands by the printing presses. Each had to be laboriously copied by hand, and the result was that few copyists could resist the temptation to introduce the modifications which local taste and custom demanded, though many of these changes were often more fantastic than reverent. But the changes became at last so extensive as to threaten the unity of the Roman rite, and the Council of Trent, under the guidance of Pope Pius V., determined upon a complete revision of the liturgical books and in particular of the Missal. From this point the Missal came under the direct care and control of the Pope himself, and was thus made secure against further corruption. The use of printing also helped to do away with changes in the text, and Abbot Cabrol notes that the finest examples of the new art were either Bibles or Missals. But it may well be doubted whether the best example of the printer's art can approach the beautiful manuscript Missals of the earlier centuries. There are hundreds of magnificent specimens in existence, forming the greatest treasures of many old libraries. Even in their own day they were of great value, and were handed on from one priest to another as precious legacies. Students for the priesthood had to write them out with their own hands, possibly with the idea of making them familiar with the prayers and ceremonies, and no doubt they displayed all their skill in doing so. They were bidden to have them ready before ordination. The will of the tenth century Bishop Theodred announces that he gives to St. Paul's church, "my two best Mass vestments that I have . . . and my best mass-book"; and to another friend he leaves, "the two mass-books that Gosebright bequeathed to me." The more precious of these Missals were written in letters of gold and silver and enriched with beautiful illu-

<sup>1</sup> "Liturgia Historica," p. 41.

minations. They were also placed in sumptuous bindings and kept in caskets of rare workmanship. It is interesting to note, as a proof of the interest of the Holy Father in matters liturgical, that, under his special tutelage, the most valuable texts and manuscripts in the Vatican Library are being published in phototype editions for the use of students. The "Missale Gothicum," an uncial codex of the seventh century, has already appeared and others are in preparation.

Thus has the Missal grown from the day when the apostles and the early Church poured forth their prayers of worship and thanksgiving around the altar of the New Law, embodying the highest forms of corporate devotion. As Dom Baudot says: "For many centuries, under the name of the Sacramentary, it contained, grouped round the Holy Sacrifice, all the formulas and rites used in the holy Church of God." It expresses the devotional mind of the Church. Even the Reformers, who hated the Mass, could not do away with the prayers of the Missal which the people had grown to love. The liturgy of the new Church of England was largely drawn from the old Mass book.

Moreover, what those unfamiliar with the Missal ignore is the fact that it contains the choicest part of the Scriptures. It has verses from nearly all the psalms, which indeed were once sung in their entirety. It has extracts from most of the books of the Old Testament, over four hundred passages from the Gospels, and selections also from practically all the Epistles. But, apart from the inspired Word of God, the most valuable part of the Missal is its treasure of collects or prayers. Many of them date from the fourth century and thus come recommended by the approval of the ages. All these early prayers are of a simple and austere beauty, instinct with feeling yet with an entire absence of sentimentalism. Take, for instance, the collect for the Third Sunday after Pentecost:

O God, Protector of them who hope in Thee, Thou without whom there is nothing strong, nothing holy; multiply Thy mercies upon us, that with Thee for ruler and Thee for guide, we may so pass by temporal goods as not to lose the eternal. Through Our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.

It would be hard to find a more perfect example of complete, trustful, and satisfying prayer. But it is surpassed in expressiveness by that for the Fourth Sunday after Easter:

O God, who makest the minds and hearts of the faith-

ful to be of one purpose, grant to Thy people to love what Thou commandest and desire what Thou dost promise, that amidst all the varieties of our earthly existence, our hearts may there be fixed where are eternal joys.

These prayers show the genius of the Roman rite at its best. Others, owing to the Gallican influence, are more ornate; still we find in the Roman Missal such a rich spiritual treasury that we regret the more its neglect in favour of the "amateur" and sometimes unreal effusions of piety that too often appear in our prayer books, and wonder why people should contentedly read, every Sunday, the same set of prayers when it is the mind of the Church that they should avail themselves of the pleasing variety of the liturgical year. Happily, the efforts of the various societies for the spread of liturgical prayer have resulted in a number of "Missals for the Laity," many of them beautifully produced and easy to follow and the growing sale of these Missals is a striking proof of the readiness of the faithful to participate in the liturgy and so be able to follow more closely the priest at the altar. Perhaps this is best seen in the extraordinary success of the work done by Dr. Parsch, of Austria, and the society under his care. A form of leaflet Missal has been devised and every week a separate leaflet containing the whole of the Sunday Mass is distributed to the extent of 100,000 copies weekly.<sup>1</sup> But it is the liturgical zeal of the Benedictines of the Abbey of St. André by Bruges, of which mention has already been made, that compels the warmest admiration. The Abbey is sometimes called the "Home of the Daily Missal" from the famous "Missel Quotidien," which had, and still has, a phenomenal sale. There is also published a smaller Missal for Sundays only. There is even a Boy Scout edition and, happily enough, even the children have not been forgotten. Dom Gaspar Lefebvre edited for them, in 1929, "The Child's Daily Missal," a most attractive book with more than 300 illustrations in colour by the gifted liturgical artist, René de Cramer. It has also been published in English by the Lohmann Co. in America. Moreover, the monks edit a

<sup>1</sup> THE MONTH for June notices a similar Italian enterprise which started this year at Milan, viz., "La Santa Messa per il Popolo Italiano," issued weekly and on the greater feasts, an attractively produced pamphlet containing the Ordinary and Proper for each Mass. The practice has also been introduced into several American dioceses.



regular publication called *Liturgia*, which is translated into English and appears under the title, *Catholic Liturgy*.<sup>1</sup>

But, beyond doubt, the greatest service that has been rendered to the liturgical movement in this country is due to Abbot Cabrol. The editions of the Missal in English, which have been produced by Herder under his careful editorship, are sure to help all layfolk to follow with real understanding the liturgy of the Sundays and feasts. Besides the Daily Missal, there is one which every Catholic should possess. "My Missal," meant for Sundays and the greater feasts only, is simplicity itself, containing all the Masses for these days with devotions for Confession and Communion. It is beautifully illustrated and can be bought as cheaply as 1s. 6d. Then there is the "Simple Missal," issued by the C.T.S., which costs only the humble shilling, and is simple to follow. As Father Martindale says in "The Mind of the Missal," and the words are an encouragement:

It is good to know the Missal, and to know *about* the Missal, and above all to share the Mind of the Missal. For then you know that the Mind of the Church which made the Missal is also yours. Little by little the rich treasures of that mind reveal themselves. . . . *You* are increased and richer and your whole activity is developed and intensified, and you *act* during Mass—you *offer* your Mass—you "do this," as Our Lord bade,—quite differently.

The sooner the Missal is known and loved, the sooner will love of the Mass grow. It will cease to be a customary service that we attend and watch or use as an occasion for private devotions. The Missal will show it to us in all its changing beauty. Our prayer at Mass will be the prayer of the Church, surely and corporatively directed to the throne of God.

H. McEVROY.

<sup>1</sup> English Catholics will be glad to know that all the publications of the Abbey of St. André may be obtained from Mr. G. Coldwell, Red Lion Passage, London, the enthusiastic representative of the Liturgical Apostolate in England. Teachers especially will find that he has much help to offer them in interesting children in the Missal and the liturgy of the Church.

## THE HEALING HAND

### I. VALENTINE GREATRAKES

**T**HERE is hardly any aspect of Christian Science teaching which leaves the critic more unsatisfied than Mrs. Eddy's contention that the truth of the whole system may be demonstrated by its cures. In "Science and Health," as well as in her other writings, she comes back to this point again and again. Every principle laid down in that work is proved, she alleges, by the healing of what is commonly supposed to be bodily disease. The whole section entitled "Fruitage" is taken up with an enumeration of the marvels wrought by Christian Science methods upon those whom medical skill had been unable to help. To heal corporal or mental ailments is presented as the first of duties. We are to learn of Christ, not by anything so foolish as being meek and humble of heart, or by denying ourselves and taking up our cross and following Him, but by curing the maladies incident to human infirmity. Thus, for example, she writes:

Though demonstrating his control over sin and disease, the great Teacher by no means relieved others from giving the requisite proofs of their own piety. He worked for their guidance, that they might demonstrate the power as he did, and understand its divine Principle. Implicit Faith in the Teacher and all the emotional love we can bestow on him, will never alone make us imitators of him. We must go and do likewise, else we are not improving the great blessings which our blessed Master worked and suffered to bestow on us.<sup>1</sup>

There are numberless similar passages in Mrs. Eddy's writings; I quote only the first which comes to hand. It is therefore upon the healing of disease that the whole stress is laid. He who cures the sick in the name of Christ and Mrs. Eddy, has demonstrated that she is an inspired woman and that her doctrine is true in every particular. Hence the long recital of ailments which have yielded to the treatment of herself and her disciples and which range from inveterate

<sup>1</sup> "Science and Health" (Ed. 1906), p. 25. Mrs. Eddy does not capitalize the pronouns referring to Our Saviour.

drug and tobacco habits to dislocated femurs, and from lifelong sciatica to the last stages of phthisis. It is true that with regard to these cures she is very chary of anything which is even remotely evidential. Names, dates, medical certificates or any details which could lend themselves to investigation are systematically withheld. You have to take her word for it all. Nevertheless I am by no means prepared to deny that Christian Science healers have achieved, and do still achieve, some remarkable successes. The trouble is that many other practitioners who repudiate every one of Mrs. Eddy's distinctive principles, and who believe in the stern reality of disease and pain, have accomplished equally remarkable and still better attested cures. Are we to infer that the philosophical tenets of these rivals in the field are similarly demonstrated by the wonders which they work? How did "the Reverend Mother," as Mr. Fisher calls her, manage to shut her eyes not only to the history of such healers in the past, but to the claims which were being urged all around her in her own lifetime? Of M. Coué and Mr. Hickson, no doubt, nothing had been heard at the time when she first took to charging a fee of 300 dollars for an elementary course of instruction at her Metaphysical College in Boston (Mass.). But Dr. Newton in New York and the Zouave Jacob in France had been well to the fore more than ten years earlier, and one is surprised that a lady who claimed to be so profound a student of therapeutics had apparently no knowledge of the fame acquired long ago by the cures of Prince von Hohenlohe and Bridget Bostock, not to speak of the miracles at Lourdes and other shrines.

That the whole subject, despite the progress made of late years in the field of neurology, abounds in unsolved problems, I should be the first to admit. It is consoling to find that even in the medical profession distinguished specialists now seem disposed to recognize the mysterious character of many "faith cures." Taking a wide view of the facts, these distinctly point to the existence of some natural faculty in certain individuals of influencing, with or without contact, not only the minds but the physical conditions and reactions of people brought into relation with them. As a working hypothesis, though recognizing all the time that to talk of "etheric vibrations" may be just as inappropriate as to argue about the "electric fluid," it is at least conceivable that some vibratory process is set up in one individual which may or may not meet

with response in a neighbouring organism and be resolved into a beneficial influence. Perhaps this faculty, as seems to be the case with the gift which we call telepathy, exists in a rudimentary form in every human individual and moreover is capable of development. This would explain why among people, like Christian Science healers, who systematically attempt to exercise it, these influences are much more noticeable than among the common herd of mankind who go to their graves without ever realizing that such a power was within their grasp. It may, in any case, be interesting to devote a few pages to consider a conspicuous example as seen in the career of that strange individual, Valentine Greatrakes, "the Stroker," who lived in the seventeenth century. I can make no pretence to original research in this matter. There is probably not much more to be learnt about him than has long ago been recorded in print. But while we should be glad to have fuller evidence upon many points, the little we do know is very curious.

Greatrakes, though of English descent, was born at Affane in county Waterford in the year 1628. He was a gentleman of fair education, a Protestant, seemingly with Puritan sympathies, and when the disturbances broke out in Ireland in the year 1641, the family for six years took refuge in England. During Cromwell's campaign in Ireland he fought on the side of the Parliamentarians, holding a commission as lieutenant in Lord Broghill's regiment of horse, and in this he served until the corps was disbanded in 1656. As some sort of recognition of his devotion to the Cromwellian cause he was then appointed Clerk of the Peace in the county of Cork, Registrar for Transplantation, and Justice of the Peace. He was deprived of these offices at the Restoration, but he does not seem to have been further penalized, for we hear of him as High Sheriff for the county of Waterford in 1663. It was just before this date, when he was 34 years old, that there came to him a conviction of his possession of healing powers. In the "Letter to the Hon. Robert Boyle" which Greatrakes wrote and published in 1666, he gave an account of his first realization of this gift.

About four years since [he says] I had an impulse or strange persuasion in my own mind—of which I am not able to give any rational account to another—which did very frequently suggest to me that there was bestowed

on me the gift of curing the King's Evil, which, for the extraordinariness thereof, I thought fit to conceal for some time. But at length I told my wife, for, whether sleeping or waking, I had this impulse. But her reply was that it was an idle imagination. (But to prove the contrary, one William Maher, of Salterbridge, in the parish of Lismore, brought his son to my wife, who used to distribute medicines in charity to the neighbours; and my wife came and told me that I had now an opportunity of trying my impulse, for there was one at hand that had the Evil grievously in the eyes, throat and cheeks; whereupon I laid my hands upon the places affected, and prayed to God, for Jesus' sake, to heal him. In a few days afterwards, the father brought his son with the eye so changed that it was almost quite whole; and to be brief (to God's glory I speak it) within a month he was perfectly healed, and so continues.<sup>1</sup>

Of course the details of this cure rest entirely upon Great-rakes's own authority, which may be open to suspicion. All his early cases were cases of the King's Evil, called at a later date Scrofula but now identified with tuberculosis of a repulsive form.<sup>2</sup> Certainly his description of Margaret MacShane who had had the Evil for more than seven years leaves an impression of piteous suffering as horrible to every sense as a case of lupus. "All over her throat, neck and nose, her back and her shoulders, I could not see one place free from the Evil where you might put a sixpence." The poor victim was an object offensive to every sense, and when Great-rakes appealed to one Dr. Anthony, a famous physician, to render assistance, his only reply was "that she was eaten out with the Evil, and that all the men in Ireland could do her no good." The Stroker, however, was convinced that he had power to restore her to health, "which," he said, "accordingly fell out (God be praised), for my hand suppurated the nodes, and drew and healed the sores which formerly I could not have endured the sight of, nor touched nor smelt them without vomiting—so great an aversion had I naturally to all wounds and sores."<sup>3</sup> The cure does not

<sup>1</sup> "Letter to Boyle," pp. 22—23. The wording has been somewhat modified for brevity's sake.

<sup>2</sup> Shakespeare in *Macbeth* describes those afflicted with the King's Evil as—"strangely visited people, all swollen and ulcerous, pitiful to the eye, the mere despair of surgery."

<sup>3</sup> "Letter to Boyle," p. 24.

seem to have been in any way an instantaneous one, but six weeks later the woman came to his house perfectly well.

When these things were noised abroad, it was inevitable that crowds of people similarly afflicted should have recourse to him. He tells us that he stroked them and "desired God, out of His abundant mercy, to heal them; who, blessed be His name, heard my prayer, and delivered them, so that few or none, unless those whose bones were infected or eaten, returned without their cure." For two years or more this continued, during which period he "meddled with no other distempers"; but then a time came when "the ague was very epidemical, whole families being struck down by it." Thereupon the conviction again came to him that in this matter also God had given him power to help. His wife, it appears, was sceptical, but he persisted and with no less success than before. Finally, the range of his therapeutic gift was still further extended, as he describes in the following passage of the same "Letter" to Boyle.

Within some small time after this, God was pleased, by the like impulse, to discover unto me that He had given me the gift of healing; which, the morning following, I told my brother and wife, but neither of them could be prevailed upon to believe it; though, for my own part, I had a full assurance thereof within me. This impulse I had the Sunday after Easter-day, the 2nd of April, 1665, early in the morning; and the Wednesday evening I went to Cornet Deans (about some occasions I had with him) to Lismore, where there came unto me a poor man with a violent pain in his loins and flank, so that he went almost double, and having also a grievous ulcer in his leg, very black, who desired me for God's sake, to lay my hands on him; whereupon I put my hands on his loins and flank, and immediately went the pains out of him, so that he was released and could stand upright without trouble; the ulcer also in his leg was healed; so that within two days he returned to his labour as a mason.<sup>1</sup>

By this time the recourse to the Stroker had become so considerable that he found it necessary to put some order into his activities. Three days in the week, from six in the morning until six at night, were set apart for this work. As

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 26—27.

the barns and outhouses of his own home were insufficient for the purpose, he built rough sheds, to receive the sufferers. He accepted no remuneration of any kind, but often travelled a considerable distance to give help to those who could not come to him. Some of the clergy took the alarm and he was summoned before the Bishop's Court by the Dean of Lismore, but though he disregarded the injunction issued to refrain in future from these practices, he does not seem to have been any further interfered with.

So far we have only Greatrakes's own account of the success he met with and of the sensation his cures produced, but in the news-sheets of 1665 we learn that the matter had already begun to attract attention in London itself. In particular Sir Roger L'Estrange in *The Intelligencer* published at successive dates quite a number of paragraphs forwarded from some correspondent in Dublin. The first of these seems to have appeared on July 13th in the following terms:

Dublin. July 5.—For this month past there has been great talk of one Greatrates [*sic*], and of strange cures he has done, only with touching or stroaking; whereof we have received divers letters from Cork, and of the multitudes that flock about him. I was not willing to trouble you with the particulars of a story of so idle and phantastick an appearance, but finding that many wiser than myself begin to be somewhat affected with the thing, I'll tell you as briefly as I can what I have heard concerning this person.

He is, by some that know him well, reported for a very civil, frank and well-humour'd man; conformable to the discipline of the Church, born in Munster; a gentleman of English extraction; sometime a Lieutenant in Col. Farr's [Phaire's] regiment; master of a competent estate; and he takes neither money nor present for his cures.

After mentioning that "Greatrates" had spent some time at Youghal, the correspondent proceeds to quote a letter from a friend of his resident at Clonmel who states that no one who had not seen it could believe the crowds who flocked to Youghal to be healed. "Two or three ships well freighted out of England with all diseases, are most returned well home," and then the letter continues:

But that which I saw, was a plowman of Mr. John



Mandeville's in this country, so afflicted with the sciatica, that he was for six miles brought hither in a car. I saw him come very much labouring and limping into the chamber. He chafed his thigh, and asked: "Where is the pain now?" He said, "In the leg." He chafed there, and asked, "Where now?" The fellow cried, "Oh, in the top of his buttock." There he chafed also, and asked, "Where now?" Then he said, "In his foot." And he chafed it there to his great toe, where it went away. The fellow in my hearing confessed himself well, and I saw him leap and dance, and go away well. 'Tis so strange to me, I know not what to say to it, and his cure is altogether by touch.

In another Dublin letter printed in *The Intelligencer* for July 27, 1665, the correspondent states that he had seen a communication from a lady whom he knew "to be a prudent and very excellent person," in which she declares that she had been "an eye-witness in her own house of above three-score cured by him in one night, of deafness, blindness, cancers, sciaticas, palsies, impostumes, fistulas, and the like, who went away by the blessing of God well-recovered." Finally, it is the same correspondent, we may presume, who reports in *The Intelligencer* of August 21, 1665, a visit paid by "Greatrates" to Dublin itself. He says amongst other things:

During his continuance here, he passed divers examinations, both publick and private, and in the end there was not anything criminal objected against him. I did myself see him stroak several, and about twenty of them declared themselves perfectly cured. And I have likewise discoursed with many others that have found no benefit at all by him. And some there are whose pains are returned after they thought themselves well recovered; so that upon the whole matter the world is divided about him; only it cannot be denied that what he does is with the least appearance of vanity that may be; and for profit, it is clear that he aims not at it. A thing much to be admired it is that, after so many inquiries into the manner and effect of his proceedings, he has never yet been detected of any fraud or imposture; but he is still followed by great multitudes of infirm and diseased people for remedy and relief. In the ordinary course of his life he appears to be a person of

a friendly, sociable humour, and free from that popularity-seeking and ostentation which commonly attends men of his pretensions.

This, I must confess, impresses me as an honest and straightforward appreciation by a witness who had no purpose of his own to serve. Greatrakes's failures were unquestionably numerous. Flamstead the astronomer visited him but derived no benefit. The headaches of Lady Conway, in whose behalf the healer was persuaded to visit England, were similarly unrelieved. This seems to have been the only case in which any remuneration was accepted by him. He received £155 for the expenses of his journey and on account of what he termed "the hazards of the enraged seas."<sup>1</sup> None the less, in spite of this somewhat costly disappointment, Viscount Conway and his wife at Ragley Castle did not consider themselves imposed upon and did not turn against him. He is stated, on the contrary, to have effected a great number of cures in the neighbourhood, and during his stay in England he gained many ardent supporters among people who both socially and intellectually were prominent and highly respected. The Hon. Robert Boyle, one of the founders of the Royal Society, was conspicuous among them and with him we may associate Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey (whose murder at a later date is famous in history for its connexion with Titus Oates's alleged Popish Plot), Andrew Marvell, the poet, Ralph Cudworth, honoured as a philosopher and theologian, George Rust, Bishop of Dromore, John Wilkins, who afterwards became Bishop of Chester, Benjamin Whichcote, a patient whom he healed, and many others. Ralph Thoresby, the diarist, subsequently communicated to the Royal Society a paper entitled "An Account of the Cures done by Mr. Gretorex, the Stroker,"<sup>2</sup> and this statement seems to have made a favourable impression on John Evelyn; for the latter, long after Greatrakes's death, wrote to Thoresby—

The narrative of the wonderful cures done by the famous Stroker is very particular, and worth recording for the strange operation and power of the animal spirits, so vigorous in his constitution, as by a certain sanative

<sup>1</sup> There is abundant evidence that Greatrakes accepted the invitation very reluctantly, and crossing in December was driven by a gale far out of his course past Land's End. See M. H. Nicolson, "Conway Letters" (1930), p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in the "Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society." Vol. XXI., pp. 332 seq.

virtue to be able to vanquish and put to flight such troublesome distempers; especially where the imagination entertains a confidence in the agent applying and pursuing the affected part with his warm and balsamic touch.

. . . To my observation, the cures he commonly pretended to were most effectually on tumours, aches, rheumatisms, and other wandering distempers; but did not extend to fevers, agues, pleurisies, etc., where the habit is vitiated. However, I say, the history is by no means to be slighted. He was some time with Mr. Digby (son to the famous Sir Kenelm) in Rutlandshire, where he was much followed.<sup>1</sup>

Special interest must attach to the testimony supplied in letters from a son of the Colonel Phaire under whom Greatrakes had at one time served and whom he had visited in Ireland. Extracts from these, copied in MS. Addit. 4291 in the British Museum, have been printed in *The Spiritual Magazine* by Mr. T. Shorter and a few passages may be quoted here. For example, Col. Phaire's son, after referring to the "great throng of people" which gathered at their house to solicit help from Greatrakes, remarks:

All disorders were not obedient to his touch, but he failed in few. My father, who had the least implicit faith of any man, was in a violent fever, and Mr. Greatrakes turned it away in two minutes. He had at another time a terrible ague, which when the fit struck him Mr. Greatrakes cured in a minute or two by holding him by the wrists, and he never had a fit after. He also cured a sister of mine of the King's Evil by stroaking.

Phaire junior tells us further that "Greatrakes was of large stature and surprizing strength," and he adds, "He had the largest, heaviest and softest hand, I believe, of any man of his time; to which I do attribute the natural reason of the great virtue in his hand above other men's." It seems certain that after the healer, who left England towards the close of 1666, had returned to his Irish home he lost in large measure his gift of curing disease. The younger Phaire did not know him in his prime. "In my time," he writes, "his virtue was much abated," but he goes on:

I have heard my two eldest sisters (who were women grown), and my eldest brother, and my father and mother, and many other honourable people, that would

<sup>1</sup> J. Evelyn to Ralph Thoresby, July 19, 1699. Vol. I. Thoresby's Letters, etc., p. 382.

speak nothing but truth, often say that they have many times seen him stroke a violent pain from the shoulder to the elbow, and so to the wrist, and thence to the top of the thumb, and by holding it strongly there for some time, it had evaporated. There are many wonderful relations of this kind which, though assuredly true, have so much the air of romance that I have no pleasure in relating them.

Lord Conway who, as we have seen, had brought Greatrakes to England, in spite of his failure to obtain any benefit for Lady Conway,<sup>1</sup> was none the less convinced of the Stroker's remarkable gifts. In a letter to his brother, the Viscount declared: "Before Mr. Greatrakes' arrival I did not believe the tenth part of those things which I have been an eye-witness of; and several others, of as accurate judgment as any in the Kingdom, who are come hither out of curiosity, do acknowledge the truth of his operations." Lord Conway goes on to recount how the son of a certain prebendary came to visit Greatrakes on the recommendation of the Bishop of Gloucester, "having a leprosy from head to foot which hath been judged incurable above ten years."

In my chamber [Lord Conway asserts] he cured him perfectly; that is, from a moist humour—'twas immediately dried up, and began to fall off—the itching was quite gone, and the heat of it taken away. The youth was transported to admiration. . . . After all, I am far from thinking that his cures are at all miraculous. I believe it is by a sanative virtue and a natural efficiency, which extends not to all diseases, but is much more proper and effectual to some than to others; as he doth also dispatch some with a great deal of ease, and others not without a great deal of pains.<sup>2</sup>

Although Greatrakes was virulently assailed by scurrilous ballad writers and by some churchmen—notably by Dr. David Lloyd in his "Wonders no Miracles"—there seems to

<sup>1</sup> Lady Conway, daughter of Sir Henry Finch, Speaker of the House of Commons, was a very remarkable woman and "learned beyond her sex." She was a metaphysician, reading Plato and Aristotle in the original. She suffered so terribly from her headaches that she went to France in order that her cranium might be opened, but the French surgeons declined to perform the operation. The famous F. M. Van Helmont came for a time to reside at Ragley Castle as her physician. See Nicolson, "Conway Letters" (1930), where a very full account of Greatrakes is given.

<sup>2</sup> This letter is printed in "The Rawdon Papers" (1819), pp. 212—213. Lord Conway goes on to describe the above remarkable cure as "the least of forty that we have seen."

have been a good deal of party feeling in these attacks. They contain many demonstrable falsehoods, and much animus, but no serious disproof of the cures. It was in reply to "Wonders no Miracles" that the Stroker printed his "Letter to Boyle," and the certificates thereto appended, signed by physicians, surgeons and men of the highest intellectual standing, bearing testimony to what their own eyes had witnessed, cannot be lightly dismissed. Bishop Rust, the friend of Jeremy Taylor, claims to have seen Greatrakes lay hands on well nigh a thousand sufferers. Despite many failures, he avers that "there is something in it more than ordinary, but I am convinced it is not miraculous."<sup>1</sup>

This opinion that the healing was a *natural* process was shared by many intelligent people who were in close contact with these cures. The famous Dr. Henry More appealed to them as confirmatory of his own thesis "that there may very well be a sanative and healing contagion, as well as one that is morbid and venomous"; and some such theory, however we phrase it, seems to be suggested by the fact that the Stroker's powers began to fail him when he had reached middle age. Greatrakes himself inclined to the view that he was expelling some kind of evil spirit, and he was puzzled by the strange process by which the malefic influence was *chased* out, quitting "in some cases at their eyes, in others at their fingers and in others again at their ears or mouths." As an observer describes:

By the application of his hand at last he would drive the morbid matter into some extreme part, suppose the fingers, and especially the toes, or the nose or tongue, into which parts when he had forced it it would make them so cold and insensible that the patient would not feel the deepest prick of a pin; but as soon as his hand should touch these parts, or gently rub them, the whole distemper vanished, and life and sense immediately returned to these parts.

To those who may be at all familiar with the accounts which have been left us of the exorcisms which used to take place during the sixteenth century at Rome or at Bologna there is something in the healer's methods strangely reminiscent of the process by which the evil spirit was, as they believed, driven from point to point into some extremity and thence eventually expelled.

HERBERT THURSTON.

<sup>1</sup> Nicolson, "Conway Letters," p. 274.

## TEMPERANCE *VERSUS* PROHIBITION

**I**N the age-long campaign between puritanism and libertinism,—between a mistaken restraint, and an excessive indulgence, of the animal side of human nature,—the Catholic, shunning either extreme, is exposed to the assaults of both. He goes some way with the antinomian in his zeal for liberty, and some way with the formalist in his support of law: he goes the whole way with neither; but, in obedience to his faith and training, keeps the virtuous middle course. So he is condemned by the libertine as a puritan and by the puritan as a libertine, and, knowing the reason, bears this result with equanimity as another proof that he is right.

The fact that, almost alone amongst the millions of the United States of America, Catholics kept their heads when the flagrant abuses and corruption of the drink-traffic finally led multitudes to think that total abolition was the only way of checking a gigantic abuse, is one obvious instance of this balanced moral attitude. They condemned the intolerable abuses of the saloon which were poisoning the whole political and social life of the country, but they could not approve of the remedy engineered by the Puritans. Many Catholics may have acquiesced in Prohibition for one reason or another,—it was passed by the State legislatures, not by direct popular vote,—Catholics are free to uphold it, if they think that it was necessary to save their country, and no one can deny its incidental benefits, but, whilst no Catholic has been able to show that it is in real harmony with Catholic doctrine, Bishops and theologians have, from the first, exposed its moral invalidity. There are said to be a few Catholic prohibitionists—Dr. John A. Ryan<sup>1</sup> records them as “considerably less than five hundred in the entire United States”—but they must be either unaware of the ethical import of the measure or they must consider that the moral condition and prospects of the country were so bad, through incapacity to resist over-indulgence, that the State, to prevent national collapse, had no choice but to try to remove altogether the temptation to drink. If that were indeed the case, all Catholics would agree with them. *Salus reipublicæ, suprema lex.*

<sup>1</sup> “Questions of the Day,” p. 25.

Those two postulates—that the nation as a whole was being ruined by drink and that there was no remedy short of total and universal prohibition—would form the only moral justification for such an invasion of personal liberty. The *benefit* of the State is not enough : there must be question of its *esse*, its very existence. Otherwise, the application of the principle could not stop there. There are many other forms of self-indulgence and excess, which interfere to a greater or less extent with national welfare. Some liquor-prohibitionists have already marked down tobacco as the next foe to eliminate, for a colossal amount of national wealth goes up daily in smoke without any proportionate benefit. And who shall estimate the waste caused by unnecessary expenditure in hats and cosmetics and haberdashery and countless forms of amusement? Once you admit the right of the State to control, by sumptuary laws of so searching a character, the habits and expenses of the citizen, you tend to turn the nation into a nursery, and, as regards the United States, additional point is given to the witticism that the Europe-gazing Statue of Liberty in New York Harbour is the divorced wife of Uncle Sam.

Accordingly, the reason why Catholics condemn Prohibition is not because it has been unsuccessful, and causes as much moral degeneration and waste as the old saloon, if not more : a completely successful measure would be equally unjust, unless its success were the result of the citizens' willing acceptance of it. If a whole nation wishes to forgo any particular right, it is as free to do so as an individual, but the renunciation must be practically unanimous, or else the minority, who have not renounced it, are deprived of what they have a just claim to. We do not, in spite of the State votes, think that the majority of American citizens ever wanted Prohibition : it was enacted for what a certain proportion of them thought would be the benefit of the whole. It was made a Constitutional Amendment so as to put it, as far as possible, out of reach of repeal, even if future generations, as the present generation has already, found it intolerable and unworkable. It remains, in the circumstances, essentially unjust, for the evil it is meant to remedy, so far as it can be cured at all, can be met by other enactments, at once less drastic and more effective ; such as rigorous State-control. In any case, the general principle that occasional abuse of a thing susceptible of right use, justifies its entire



abolition, is thoroughly immoral. We sin in a multiplicity of ways through our senses: would morality be rightly promoted by depriving us of them? No, we are taught to control and regulate our God-given senses, and thus to use them in His service and our own, and, though doubtless a man who was deaf, dumb and blind would be the less capable of sinning, he would also be very much less a man.

This, of course, is not to condemn legislating as a means to social morality. Restrictions of every sort are needed to make life in community what it ought to be, to restrain the self-assertiveness of the group and the individual, and to secure respect for just rights. The criminal is a man who does not acknowledge the dictates of conscience and the moral law, and the criminal forms a very large class in every modern deChristianized society. Add to that large body the greater host of those who do not reject God's law but are too ignorant or too slack to be ruled by it in detail, and the need, great and growing, of external law, so as to secure some degree of justice and good behaviour, will be evident. Now, when you have a substance in nature which has many rightful and beneficent uses, like the alcohol which gives its attraction to every form of "strong drink," but which also has the effect of diminishing self-control and regard for law, obviously the civilized State cannot be indifferent as to its use. Hence, in every country some form of State-control of the manufacture and sale of strong drink is maintained. The substance is made dearer by excise and customs duties and less accessible by restrictions on hours and places of sale, and thus those likely to exceed are to some extent safeguarded against their own weakness. Those who have attained self-mastery through obedience to conscience have to submit to these inconveniences for the sake of their weaker brethren. And, as usual when a strong financial interest has been created in some commodity in great demand, the State has constantly to oppose the endeavours made by those, whose livelihood is involved in the sale and manufacture of strong drink, to push their wares regardless of the general interest. Like munition-makers, who are such a danger to international peace, brewers, distillers and publicans deal with a product lawful in itself but extremely liable to abuse, and they must expect, and should not resent, regulation by those responsible for the national well-being. It was acknowledged by the "liquor-interests" in the States that reaction to their anti-social

activities, prolonged, poisonous and seemingly beyond control as they were, formed the main driving-force of the Prohibition movement.

To the Catholic rejection of Prohibition as opposed to reason and the natural law, we must add another on religious grounds. The measure is supported by many who are, unconsciously it may be, Manichæan heretics, holding the view that there is something intrinsically evil in strong drink, which indeed they personify as a demon. No doubt, many of their denunciations are super-heated rhetoric, not to be analysed as sober statements, but, even allowing for the auto-intoxication of perfervid orators, there are many traces of Manichæism in the literature and speeches of Prohibitionists. It is this that inspires their anti-drink campaign with real religious zeal, for genuine zeal may spring from error. They have made total abstinence a command instead of a counsel. Their unwillingness to have any truck with the accursed thing forms a real barrier, in America as in England, to the rational solution of the question, the removal of private interest from the drink-traffic by some system of State ownership and control. A movement based so largely on what is false, supported by emotional fanaticism, tainted so visibly with heresy, should arouse Catholic opposition on those grounds alone, however genuine the evils against which it is directed. Sixty years ago Cardinal Manning stated the Catholic doctrine and practice in very plain terms—"I repeat distinctly that any man who should say that the use of wine, or any other like thing, is sinful when it does not lead to drunkenness,—that man is a heretic, condemned by the Catholic Church. With that man I will never work."

The chief supporters of Prohibition in the States and of the Anti-Saloon League, which was mainly responsible for its enactment, are also, unhappily, the declared foes of the Catholic Church, not only in North America, but in South as well, and in the Catholic countries of Europe. I refer to the Methodists and kindred bodies, who, although in this country they rarely oppose the just claims of Catholics, are notoriously virulent in their campaign against the Church elsewhere. So skilled and energetic are they in the States in trying to engineer legislation to favour their sectarian views, that they have been reckoned, along with Democrats and Republicans, as a third political Party. It is, therefore, not surprising that Catholics should view with apprehension the predomi-

nant influence of this fanatical body in the administration of the Volstead Act: as a matter of fact, although wine for sacramental purposes is expressly excluded from the purview of the Act, the procuring of it is often so hedged about by insulting State restrictions that there is evident a desire to prohibit it altogether.<sup>1</sup> That any Catholics can, in the circumstances, be found to favour Prohibition argues a somewhat defective appreciation of its unethical and unCatholic spirit.

Happily, the basic and inherent weakness of the enactment has already brought it to the first stages of collapse, and that resulting situation provides what one may call a chance for promoting real Temperance. If Prohibition really expressed the will and purpose of the vast majority of United States citizens, there would be no need for it. By their voluntary abstinence, by their association in large teetotal groups, by the example they showed of physical, financial and moral well-being, they could, being so very numerous and zealous, reduce the drink traffic to small and manageable dimensions. But the felt need of enacting the Eighteenth Amendment showed that its promoters had not really got that immense voluntary backing which alone could make it successful. There was not enough voluntary abstention before its enactment to make it accord with popular desire, and there is probably much less now. Therefore, all who value the virtue of self-control in this matter, whether expressed by strict moderation or by entire abstention, will rejoice that this ill-advised and disastrous experiment is about to be abandoned. However much Republican politicians in the States may try to hide their *volte face*, they are evidently now of one mind with their more outspoken Democratic opponents in desiring the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, on the grounds at least of its utter failure to effect its purpose and the immense financial losses, both direct and indirect, which it has caused the country. No party, of course, likes to own to having made a silly and costly mistake, yet the evidence, provided both officially by a Presidential Commission, and unofficially by a Press straw-vote; provided, moreover, by the experience of all who had eyes to see the facts and the sense and honesty to admit their bearing; has become so overwhelming that

<sup>1</sup> One priest in Colorado had to take out two State permits, to sign nine documents and get his Bishop to sign five, before he could get a consignment of altar-wine, which was described in the forms as "intoxicating liquor"! See *America*, May 28, 1932, p. 186.

now, in spite of the disingenuous propaganda of the Prohibitionist press (well-matched, let us own, in "truth-watering" by the Drink Traffic journals), a real endeavour will undoubtedly be made to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment, and remit to the State Legislatures the control of the Liquor Trade. The investigations of the "Association against the Prohibition Amendment" into its working, published two years ago at the close of the first decade, give an appalling picture of the moral and political corruption traceable to the endeavours to enforce it. The Wickersham Commission Report, published in January, 1931, though inconclusive in its findings, showed that belief in the possibility of enforcement had almost disappeared. Prominent Prohibitionists, headed by the multi-millionaire, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., have openly "ratted" from the cause, one of them writing plaintively—"When we tried national prohibition, I thought it would wipe out liquor. But it simply won't work."<sup>1</sup> We note that all these converts now oppose prohibition, not because it is morally objectionable as an unwarranted limitation of human liberty and responsibility, but because it is practically unenforceable. If it did work, they would support it. "I hate liquor. I always hated it," wrote the above-quoted back-slider, showing the Manichæan mentality that inspires so many. There is little sign, we must confess, amongst the politicians and business men who want repeal, of any concern for the violation of rightful liberty involved in the Amendment. Even the 40,000 lawyers, the 60,000 doctors and the 77,860 bankers who voted against Prohibition, at the instance of the *Literary Digest* this spring, in the several proportions of 75.77 per cent, 75.48 per cent, and 65.83 per cent, had mainly in view the health and prosperity of their clients. Almost alone amongst Catholics is there any stable recognition of the true moral issues involved, although to their credit the Episcopalian representatives a year or so ago gave a majority vote for repeal. But when that happens it will only be the result of a prevalent conviction amongst Americans, not that man's natural rights have been grossly outraged, but that the "experiment" has become too costly, too complicated, too ineffective, too productive of crime and disorder, to be persevered in. It was carried by a combination of fanaticism and Big Business. The latter element is now giving it up. The illicit liquor interests, the creation of

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in *The Commonwealth*, July 27, 1932.

the Amendment, remain, of course, on the side of the zealot. Still, in eleven States out of the forty-eight, but the eleven include about half the population, there are "wet" Legislatures, which means that, even if repeal is delayed, no attempt will henceforth be made to enforce Prohibition by State agents.

In this *impasse*, the virtue of Temperance, which Prohibition aimed at making unnecessary, may come into its own again. If we take the coming Presidential election as marking the beginning of the end of Prohibition, it is not a little suggestive that the date will almost coincide with the first centenary of the first voluntary Total Abstinence Society in England. During this year, the memory of the Seven Men of Preston, the original signers of the teetotal pledge, has been, and is being, very justly celebrated by British Temperance Societies everywhere, although the actual date of the signatures was September 1, 1832. Joseph Livesey and his companions were on the right lines: their profession of total abstinence was wholly voluntary, and inspired in the main by moral motives—the desire to help others by the example of abstemiousness, and to oppose the spread of a ruinous habit of indulgence. In our own comparatively sober days, it is not easy to realize the wide-spread ravages of strong drink a century ago, when public opinion still tolerated the spectacle of much habitual drunkenness, even amongst the otherwise refined and educated classes, and when few other forms of "recreation" were within easy reach of the worker. The law was hesitating and ineffective, Parliament trying to check public excess by alternately raising or lowering the taxes on spirits, on wines, and on beer, with the sole result of spreading the ill-habit of excess. So reformers were taught to rely only on their own efforts and, realizing that sober individuals make a sober community, they began to practise for example's sake entire abstinence. It is noteworthy that the earlier pledge-bound societies renounced the use of spirits only. It was the seven Prestonians who first realized the illogicality of abstaining from alcoholic drink in one form, whilst consuming it in another.

There is still need of that example of voluntary abstinence, for not only is enforced Prohibition crumbling to its end, but also the strong constraint of the Christian moral law has ceased to influence the lives of multitudes. All through these dozen years of "virtue by Act of Parliament," the Catholics of the United States, through journals like *America* and *The*

*Commonweal* and through publicists like Dr. John A. Ryan of Washington and Father James Gillis of *The Catholic World*, have valiantly upheld the Catholic ideal and exposed with learning and eloquence the false assumptions and unjust methods of the Prohibitionists. They have striven to remove from the reputation of the American people the reproach that unthinking zealots have cast upon it—that that great nation alone of the peoples of the world cannot be trusted as a whole to use one of God's gifts with moderation, and thus have to be deprived, as if they were savages or children, of the opportunity of use. They have pilloried and exposed the inevitable results of this foolish attempt to dragoon an entire people into arbitrary social habits. At the same time, they have denounced the abuse of drink, and the anti-social methods of drink-traders with Christian vigour, and upheld the Christian ideal of voluntary self-control. If Prohibitionists have erred, or continue to err, through trying to enforce a mistaken ideal by unjust means, it is because they have broken with the age-long tradition of Christianity, so admirably voiced by the Catholics in their midst.

They will need to preach it with increased vigour when, the Eighteenth Amendment having been repealed, there will arise a natural reaction against its restrictions. Finland, which adopted Prohibition in the same year as the United States did, repealed the law last February, but has since been obliged to curb excess by special temporary legislation. It is this possibility which gives its significance to the revival of the American National Total Abstinence Union, which, like similar organizations, lost ground when abstention was made compulsory, but which now, under the energetic leadership of Cardinal O'Dougherty of Philadelphia, is girding its loins in an effort to renew and surpass its former efficacy.

All that the most fervent self-sacrifice can do, in emulation of our Lord's self-denial, in reparation for the excess of others, in vindication of man's spiritual nature, in encouragement to a sinful world, will be required when America is freed again from an unjust civil law, but has not yet fully acknowledged the law of Christ. Catholics have consistently proclaimed that the drink evil, like every other sinful indulgence, though it can, to some extent, be controlled by legislation, cannot be finally suppressed except by moral education. They are, therefore, bound by their profession to show that moral education does enable men and women to resist sinful

excess, to practise moderation, and, on occasion, to give up altogether what is not necessary for themselves and what is harmful to so many. The experience of centuries has shown that for certain temperaments total abstinence from strong drink is the only safe course: it is obvious that no one becomes a drunkard except after a course of moderate drinking. But although self-preservation is an excellent motive, although there are many supplementary ones on a lower level, the highest and most inspiring is that of voluntary sacrifice, a giving up of a pleasant and lawful indulgence for the love of God, the very motive which inspires the vows of religion. Father Mathew's homely exclamation, as he signed *his* promise of total abstinence—"Here goes, in the name of God"—well expressed that ideal.

Nor does total abstinence in any way violate the Catholic claim to stand in the mean between puritanism and licentiousness. Entire abstention from strong drink is not an "extreme," having excess as its opposite and moderate use in between. That is a notion which some ill-instructed Catholics seem to entertain, whereas total abstinence is only self-control carried to a higher degree. Or, to put it more clearly, total abstinence stands to temperance as counsel to command: we are all bound to be temperate since intemperance is a sin: in total abstinence, a form of ascetic practice, we go beyond our obligations and exhibit in this matter entire self-control, with the object of giving better service to God. So whether Catholics feel impelled to make that sacrifice or not, they must recognize it as embodying a more perfect exercise of temperance. The supernatural motive must always be supreme, or else our abstention is no virtue at all, but merely a kind of human prudence or a medical necessity, or even a Pharisaic display. Obviously a strong and wide-spread band of total abstainers must be the nucleus of any movement for temperance reform, in order to provide for legislative regulations that backing of public opinion without which law is largely inoperative.

In these islands the spontaneous action of zealous Christians long forestalled the attempts of Government to stem the ravages of intemperance. The American Temperance Society of Boston had set the lead in 1826. Livesey and his colleagues at Preston followed suit in 1832, and in 1838 the great Capuchin, Father Theobald Mathew, began his famous campaign in Ireland which, for the time being, eclipsed all others and



in a few years, changed the habits of millions of people, spreading over Great Britain and the United States. With the middle of the century there came a change in the spirit of the Temperance Movement, and more reliance was placed on prudential motives, on scientific education and especially on procuring restrictive legislation. That spirit prevails to-day, to the danger, outside the Church, of losing sight of the sound religious principles and the strength-producing religious practices which are of the essence of Catholic Temperance Reform. Still, the only openly Prohibition organization in this country is the United Kingdom Alliance founded in 1853, which aims at "the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic [including, presumably, the manufacture and importation] in intoxicating liquors as beverages," an object which we are glad to see has been lately repudiated by the Temperance Council of the Christian Churches, on which Catholics are represented.<sup>1</sup> The Council states distinctly that the suppression, not of the drink *traffic*, but of the drink *evil*, *i.e.*, the excessive consumption of drink judged by the standard of morality, is the true aim of Christian reformers.

Prohibition, itself a form of moral intemperance, has wrought untold harm both to law and liberty in the United States. Its failure and approaching abandonment will, one may hope, give the idea its death-blow for all time, and leave the way open to true Temperance progress, the recognition that alcoholic beverages are unique in their physical and social effects, that their distribution in the interests of the general welfare calls for careful regulation, and that every individual is morally responsible for the use which he makes of his liberty in this matter.

JOSEPH KEATING.

<sup>1</sup> See *The New Campaigner*, No. 34, pp. 3—5.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### THE LAST HOURS OF FATHER PROUT.

"Probably no man with whom he was brought into contact, friendly or otherwise, but will hear with satisfaction that a sister of his blood and a Priest of his faith, cheered the deathbed of the lonely old wit and scholar; and helped to make his last hours pass tranquilly away."

James Hannay, Consul at Barcelona.

Correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

IT is generally thought that the celebrated "Father Prout" (the Rev. Francis Mahony) when ordained at Lucca a hundred years ago was mistaken as to the genuineness of his vocation to the priesthood; a view which is borne out by the fact that after two years he ceased to exercise sacerdotal functions and gave himself up to the literary work in London and abroad on which his fame rests. But, in any case, nothing is alleged against his life in "lay communion," and the following account (which has not, as far as we know, been published hitherto), written by a priest, Mgr. J. S. Rogerson, who attended him on his deathbed, testifies to his admirable dispositions in his last hours.—ED.

I am not surprised, my dear O'Fallon, that poor Prout's Reliques and Writings should have created in your mind and heart an affectionate anxiety to know how he really pulled through the finish of life. *He never was suspended*, as has been asserted, nor was any direct charge of denying his faith, or of being overhauled by Rome or his Ecclesiastical Superiors, ever made good against him. The Editor of the *Tablet* once spoke of him in argument as a *suspended priest*, but he challenged him to prove it in a Court of Justice, laying his damages at £2,000, when an apology was offered, and the charge withdrawn. When I spoke to him during his illness on this subject, he replied with his characteristic dry humour, "I have spoken of the *cullenization* of Ireland, and that amounts to heresy with some people."

His illness assumed a menacing character about six weeks before he died. It was connected with the throat, producing an inability to swallow: and so, I take it, he died of atrophy. He sent for me at this period, as he had done three years previously when very sick, and I continued to see him day by day. Our usual hour was late in the afternoon. He had then closed his literary labours for the day; for he continued to write for the *Globe* up to within a couple of weeks of his decease. On one of these occasions, he had not quite completed his paper, and on my showing myself at

his door, which generally stood open, he called out with some temper: "I'm busy." "All right," was my reply, "and not very civil to-day." The same evening he sent a line, written in black lead pencil on his card—zoologically apologetic: "If you will poke up a bear in his hours of digestion you must expect him to growl."

Though naturally testy and abrupt, he restrained himself in my regard, and always received me as a *Priest* who had duties to perform. I mention the above exception to display the self-conquest that had begun within him. A second small ebullition occurred during our early conferences when I suggested to him resort to *Notre Dame des Victoires* for purposes of especial devotion, urging as its privilege that it is the seat of the great Archconfraternity for the Conversion of Sinners, and a spot of holy pilgrimage sought by stricken down people of all classes when in trouble. The Empress, I remarked, is to be seen there upon occasions. He heard me sullenly, and then said, kindling into poetic flame, "Don't talk to me of *localizing* devotion: God is to be met with in all places: the canopy of heaven is the roof of his temple, and its walls are not on our horizon," etc. I was clearly in for a sharp pulling up, and knowing the importance of asserting my own position with him, I interrupted him mildly, and said: "Excuse me, I am speaking to you as a Catholic wishful to resume duty. Byron has given us his rhapsodies in some such fashion as this. Pray let me speak as a Priest and a believer. If you find me limited and illiberal, seek someone else." I had my apprehensions from the first that I was destined to encounter impatience of control and pride of intellect, and I therefore thought it well to claim my own position at once as described. He did not repeat his assault, but remained docile and teachable to the last. This is one of his little communications, exhibiting the change in operation within him.

"6 o'clock, evening.

Dear and Rev. Friend.—I am utterly unfit to accomplish the desired object this evening, having felt a giddiness of head all this afternoon, and am now compelled to seek sleep. It is my dearest wish to make a beginning of this merciful work, but complete prostration of mind renders it unattainable just now. I will call in the morning and arrange for seeing you.

Do pray for your penitent,

F. Mahony."

I remember, too, as influencing me to take this stand with him, that I had been struck with the remark of an Irish Dignitary, who, conversing with another Bishop on the subject of Father Prout, said in my presence: "I should fear him even dying." The reply was: "I should covet no greater grace than to see poor Frank prepared to die well."

At the moment, I little expected that such would be *my* responsibility, and *my* privilege: and I will now recount to you circumstances attending this event.

It occurred on Friday, March 26, 1866.<sup>1</sup> I saw him almost daily throughout the six weeks preceding. His apartment (an Entresol) was at No. 19 Rue des Montains—a distance of but a few minutes walk from St. Roch's. Our conversations, generally brief and businesslike, were sometimes prolonged, and extended into details of his past history and reminiscences. On these occasions it was a recurring reflection with him: "But I ought never to have been a Priest. I had no vocation," etc. The good Jesuit Fathers had told him so—first when making his studies in Rome with them and desiring to become a Novice, and secondly when, having renewed his application to them in Ireland, permission was obtained to repeat the experiment, but with the like result. Up to his dying day, however, he could never formulate the reasons, to his satisfaction, how and why they had, for a second time, declined to accept him. No doubt their proverbial powers of penetration enabled them to detect a prepondering excess of will and unusual intellectual endowments, with a ready armoury of dangerous wit and satire. I suggested this, and he partly assented. One thing is certain, that he never allowed his tongue or his pen to give expression to the popular denunciations against them; and God knows, he was very reckless in treating Churchmen and Church matters in general.

This sentiment, as to obtruding himself into the Church, was embodied by him in a document that I had to present in his behalf to Rome, when first he applied to me to reconcile him to the Church. This was in 1863, when, through the Archbishop's office here, I obtained permission for him "to retire for ever [as he expressed it] from within the sanctuary," and resort to lay communion for the rest of his life: and secondly, owing to his failing eyesight and advancing age, a dispensation to substitute the Rosary, or the Seven Penitential Psalms for the Breviary. He drew up this Petition himself at my suggestion, and its completeness and *Latinity* was so remarkable that the Roman ecclesiastical lawyer who charged himself with it, volunteered to me an expression of his surprise and approbation. His published specimens, however, of classical and Canine Latin are the wonder and amusement of scholars; but after years of disuse to take up his pen, and, within a couple of hours to throw off a Church document in technical details and phraseology, I must say, much surprised me also.

At the period I describe, namely, three years previously, I had the happiness to restore him to practical life in the Church, although in the subordinate degree of lay communion only, much

<sup>1</sup> "The Catholic Encyclopedia" says—"d. in Paris 18th May, 1866."

to my regret. No one was made acquainted with this fact, except one to whom he had clung with fidelity of affection from the remote period of early youth when they were fellow-Novices together at St. Acheul, good Père Lefevre—and our saintly little Bishop Grant. The latter had never turned aside from him. He had drawn him in his own sweet, winning way to enter the Sanctuary once again, during his residence in Rome in 1848, and it was the last time that he ventured to offer up the Holy Sacrifice. Many years subsequently they met, by accident, in turning the corner of the Rue de Rivoli to enter the Rue Castiglione, when the Bishop stood up in front of him, called him by his name, and taking his arm walked off with him, full of affection. He referred to this now; and requested me to communicate to these two friends, and to them only, the fact of his reconciliation.

His malady beginning to assert itself, and finding him taking to his bed without reluctance (for he fought hard to receive his friends in his usual corner), I was anxious to complete my work and administer the Sacraments. On March 23, 1866, I came to see him at my usual hour—3 o'clock—and found him seated, with a scanty amount of cover, huddled in his armchair, and expecting me. He thanked me for my "patient and persevering" attentions to him during his sickness, asked pardon of me, and of the whole world for offences committed against God and in prejudice to his neighbour, and then sinking down in front of me with his face buried in his two hands and resting them on my knees, he received from me, with convulsive sobs, the words of Absolution. His genial Irish heart was full to overflowing with gratitude to God as a fountain released at this moment, and the sunshine of his early good days had dispelled the darkness of his after-life—and he was as a child, wearied and worn out after a day's wanderings, when it had been lost and found, hungered and fed again.

I raised him up, took him in my arms and laid him on his bed, as I would have treated such a little wanderer of a child, and left him without leaves-taking on his part, for his heart was too full for words. He never after this attempted to quit his bed, or desired to see anyone. At my suggestion he consented to see his fellow-Novice the Père Lefevre, and very touching their parting was. He called him by his Novice's name "Sylvestre," embraced him, and gave him *rendes-vous* in eternity. Both were much overcome.

He received the Extreme Unction two days after this. I desired to give it earlier, but he begged to name to me the exact moment when he felt prepared for it. On my visit early the next morning he uttered the single word, "Holy Oils," and I lost no time in summoning my assistants, and with the aid of the Abbé Chantrain, I administered to him the last rites. After this he ceased to speak, and quietly died away about 9 o'clock in the

evening of Friday, March 26th, in the presence of Mrs. Woodlock, his sister and myself. We could detect the approach of the final moment, and continued through the beautiful prayers for the agonizing to appeal to God earnestly for him up to the ceasing of his breathing.

He could not, in fact, have surrounded himself with more accessories of grace, had he been permitted to sketch out his mode of quitting life, and I feel that our ever-merciful Saviour, His compassionate Mother, and the whole court of heaven must have welcomed this one other "lost and found," wounded, it may be, and having many scars, and requiring the process of renewal in Purgatorial detention, but *saved*.

No other thought or feeling comes back to me to intercept as a cloud the clear remembrances that I hold of this event, and it troubles me to hear unCatholic reflections pronounced by those whose Faith and the experiences of life, and much more, the Charity "that hopeth all things," ought to check, admonish, deter. "And thinkest thou, O man, that judgest them that do such things, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and patience and long suffering" (Rom. ii. 3, 4).

Such, my dear O'Fallon, are the circumstances that present themselves when you ask me to recall the part I took in preparing poor Father Mahony for the great transition-journey, which we are all to look to. I have written this hurriedly at last, although your first request, and the subsequent refreshers you administered, have not been overlooked by me. If after reading it over you would like me to put it into form for publication, don't hesitate to return it to me for that purpose. Asking an occasional *memento* at holy shrines which you frequent in dear grace-abounding Rome, believe me, your affectionate friend,

J. S. ROGERSON

April 23, 1877

---

#### RENÉ BAZIN.

ON the 20th of July last, the celebrated French Catholic novelist, M. René Bazin, better known perhaps than any other of his generation to British Catholics, closed his long and edifying life at Paris. As an outstanding example of the fruitful combination of literary genius with zeal for the faith, his name deserves to be held in memory and benediction amongst us.

In the opening chapter of his "Sons of the Church," Bazin speaks of the part that every human creature is called upon to play in the providential ordering of the world—

God wills that His creature should be associated with Him in the spiritual government of the world. A secret

word is spoken to each one: "Do that; go to such a one; console that sorrow; speak these words; write that letter; accept the incomparable honour of being despised for My sake." What a magnificent privilege, and no one is exempt from it. If only we had the leisure and strength to cry out; "Lord, I am ready to do this," what graces might not be given to some other creature, some family, town or nation! How great and sweet a thing to know that we are "used" by Jesus Christ.

Bazin could speak thus out of his own experience, for his whole life was devoted to putting his talents at the disposal of his Master, Christ, so as to help others, for, as he wrote, "Christianity is a great society for mutual assistance."

Born at Angers in 1853, Bazin, having taken his degree in Law at the University of Paris, returned in his twenties to profess Law at the Catholic University of his native town. This was one of five Catholic Universities (namely, Paris, Angers, Lille, Lyons and Toulouse), set up by the French Hierarchy in 1875. But it was not as a Law Professor that he was destined to make his name. In 1884, he published his first novel "Stéphanette." During the remaining half century of his life he wrote on an average a new romance every year, besides a number of books of Catholic interest—usually short biographies—and a few travel sketches: "Croquis d'Italie," "Terre d'Espagne," "Croquis de France et d'Orient."

As a novelist Bazin was recognized as one of the glories of modern French literature, although his choice of themes did not recommend him to the "emancipated." M. René Doumic, however, who is not a Catholic, speaks of Bazin as "the master of the provincial novel," and calls him "un esprit élevé." In 1904 his fame was recognized by his being made a Member of the French Academy, when Brunetière paid a great tribute to his work. Bazin was also President of the "Corporation des Publicistes Chrètiens," and a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great. As a novelist, he was not, of course, alone in describing the life of rural and provincial France. Balzac, Flaubert, Zola, the Goncourts, and Maupassant had all in their way dealt with life in the provinces, though they made it gloomy and miserable and sordid. On the other hand, Loti in his inimitable fashion celebrated Brittany, while Barres and Theuriot sang the praises of Lorraine. In this they had a good deal of the spirit of Bazin, who extols his beloved Anjou, with "une douceur angevine," a sweetness and charm that is characteristic of the region. He treats his peasants and the bourgeoisie in a kindly and sympathetic manner, exhibiting their virtues, actual and potential. In "La Terre qui meurt," he summons



the Vendéans back to their deserted countryside. The "Roi des Archers" has the manufacturing districts of Flanders for scene. To touch on even half his books would be to traverse much of France, including the restored provinces. In, perhaps, the best known of all, "Le Blé qui lève" he transports us to Belgium, and we read of those Retreats which play so large a part there in the lives of the Catholic working man. His last novel "Magnificat" is reviewed in the current MONTH.

Amongst his biographies, "Charles de Foucauld," the life of the famous hermit of the Sahara is perhaps the most remarkable, but "Sons of the Church" has a special interest for Catholics in this country, as it contains the story of the conversion of the Anglican "monks" at Caldey, now the Catholic Benedictines of Prinknash, and the Anglican "nuns" of Milford Haven, now of Talacre Abbey. In the preface to this work, Bazin gives us an illuminating glimpse of his spirit:

People are saying "these are hard times." They are not far wrong, but was there ever an easy time? . . . We want the example of men like ourselves, with weak natures, subject to ills and hardships akin to our own; tempted as we are by the sadness, but refusing to yield, richer in faith, hope, charity and courage to live their lives . . . what matter condition and race? They have prayed and are of the family; for guidance they had the same star as we; they incurred the same dangers, they were troubled by the same enemies from without, from the Church's beginning they were always the same, except in appearance and name. . . Our forefathers delighted in pouring over the Lives of the Saints. There are many signs that the present generation is coming back to love the examples of those who are greater than ourselves . . . these "Sons of the Church," brave and compassionate, faithful comrades in work and in distress, were the most lovable of men and often the most light-hearted.

So Bazin was forever portraying for our encouragement the divine in man,—the power which grace gives him of rising superior to his own weak nature and warring circumstances—and so his work is full of inspiration as well as of literary charm. As indicated above, he showed that realism should be controlled by art and guided by morality—a lesson very necessary for our own times even by those novelists and critics who are privileged to be Catholics. Of every great writer it can be said—"Defunctus adhuc loquitur:" René Bazin at least has no reason to fear the effects of his message to posterity.

T. GREENWOOD.

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The  
Disarmament  
Conference.

The fact that the Disarmament Conference is still in being—it stands adjourned for the holidays since July 24th—prevents, of course, a final judgment on its performance. But, if we were to judge by the result of six months' effort, we should not be very hopeful of its success. Before its inception last February, the Press was almost unanimous in foreboding dire disaster if it failed: yet its almost total failure has been accepted without any great protest. There are two symptoms which show, alternatively, how near to failure it has gone, and how it still provides grounds for hope—the reaction of Italy to the result and the continued optimism of Mr. Gibson, the U.S. delegate, he who proposed the Hoover plan of one-third immediate reduction, only to find it shelved in favour of a series of resolutions regarding the future. The statesmen, in palliation of their non-success, speak of the difficulty of getting sixty-four nations to agree, whereas, of course, it is a matter of the agreement of six or seven at most. Any plan for the world's security, which Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Russia and the United States chose to put their hands to, would go through without any check. It is on these Powers, or on some of them, that the blame for the continued deferring of the world's hopes must lie, and from the Conference more than half of these Powers,—Italy, Germany, Russia and the States—may claim to emerge without reproach. Germany is already disarmed—stripped of all "aggressive" weapons, with no air-force or submarines or tanks, or battleships, with a land army reduced to a police-force, and forbidden to conscript her citizens: Italy has already offered to disarm to the lowest minimum agreed to: Russia, as we know, is for total and immediate disarmament—for a time, at least. America would wipe out *at once* the formidable array of weapons we enumerated last month, amounting to one-third of her equipment, but, as the *Spectator* (July 30th) not unfairly puts it:

Mr. Hoover wants a third of the existing Washington battleships to be scrapped. The British Government refuses. He wants tanks to be scrapped. The British Government refuses. He wants bombing aeroplanes to be scrapped. The British Government refuses. He proposes a substantial reduction in cruiser tonnage. The British Government offers instead a reduction in cruiser sizes, to take effect from 1947 onwards.

The first stage of the Conference leaves the armaments budgets of all nations wholly untouched.

**Its  
Resolution.**

Still, Mr. Benesh finally proposed a resolution, intended to embody the measure of common agreement which these seven Powers, with the others, had reached, which resolution began with recording their profound conviction "that the time had come when all nations of the world must adopt substantial and comprehensive measures of disarmament in order to consolidate the peace of the world, to hasten the resumption of economic activity, and to lighten the financial burdens which now weigh upon the peoples of the world," and after setting forth in detail the various advances hitherto made, proceeds by deciding "forthwith and unanimously, guided by the general principles underlying President Hoover's declaration :

1. That a substantial reduction of world armaments shall be effected, to be applied, by a general Convention, alike to land, naval and air armaments ;
2. That a primary objective shall be to reduce the means of attack."

We need not enumerate the meagre points of agreement that follow. Few of the delegates are content with them : they are the very lowest common measure, and they all refer to the future, without any indication of method or time limit. Two nations—Germany and Russia—voted against them ; Germany because of the penal Treaty-discrimination still maintained in her regard ; Russia, because she poses as advocate of wholesale abolition of armaments. Eight others, including Italy, refused to vote for such a nugatory result of six months' labours, and the remainder accepted the resolution, *faute de mieux*, as a first step, though a very short one, in the right direction. The general disappointment, except amongst militarists, is at once a hopeful indication of the world's desire for peace and a warning to the negotiators that something more immediate and substantial will be insisted on in the second stage.

**Italy's  
Plain Speaking.**

Mr. Hugh Gibson, the United States delegate, in spite of the shelving of the President's proposals, has been polite enough to say that what had been done was all in the direction of the Hoover programme ; and that there was nothing to prevent his country from pressing for bolder measures, but the subsequent comments of Italy and Germany broke through all diplomatic practice in their outspoken arraignment of the Conference proceedings. There are occasions when such plain language is called for, and it is well that it should stand on record for the future encouragement of those who really mean business. General Balbo, the chief Italian delegate, denounced the resolution at the Conference, as "merely indicating a mode of procedure"

without stating "definite and positive principles for reduction," but later, in the *Popolo d'Italia* (July 31st), he roundly accuses the "dominating Powers at Geneva, Great Britain, France and the United States" of "working" the League and the Conference in their own interests, not really intending to disarm but trying always to preserve or increase their own relative strength, and so maintain their dictatorship of the world. Unless this conduct is changed, "Italy," says the General, "already knows the road to take." She will leave the League and bring others with her. Here is evidently expressed the sentiments of many of the League members, who have been overlooked and not consulted in the ceaseless round of unofficial discussion that goes on at Geneva. It is surely bad diplomacy not to have admitted Italy at least into those "private conversations," nor to have shown greater appreciation of her consistent endeavour to get something done. The President of the Conference should have seen to that. But it is worth noting that, a few years ago, such words and such an attitude on the part of a Great Power would have shaken the League to the foundations. Now it is strong enough to stand the shock of such criticism without injury, and, we hope, enlightened enough to benefit by it. Nor has Signor Mussolini's renewed assertion of his personal disbelief "in the possibility or utility of perpetual peace" fluttered the doves, as it might have done before the world had taken accurate stock of his temperament.

**Germany's  
Standpoint.**

The German delegate, Herr Nadolny, once more made an emphatic plea, in the name of international honesty and good-faith, for equality of rights in the matter of armaments between all nations, as foreshadowed in the Versailles Treaty. And he, too, indicated that future German collaboration in the Conference depended on the satisfactory solution of this matter. The French, obsessed by their regard for Versailles, apparently still hold the view that the military provisions of the Peace Treaty are quite distinct from negotiations for general disarmament: in other words, that whatever the result of the Disarmament Conference, one of the Great Powers engaged in it must be kept in permanent military inferiority in regard to the rest. The world, on the other hand, has always thought that the admission of Germany to the League meant the wiping out for ever of the distinction between victors and vanquished. We deprecate the tone of the German War Minister's bitter broadcast on July 26th: his "blistering sarcasms about foreign countries," as *The Times* calls them, cannot make for friendship; but undoubtedly he expressed the purpose of the whole German nation, when he declared that, unless the other Powers, according to M. Clemenceau's undertaking, make the disarmament of Germany the faithful model of

their own, he will feel free to model the German armament on theirs. *The Times* (July 28th) agrees that this "German desire to be placed on an equal footing—which is not the same as a demand for numerical equality—constitutes the most urgent problem of disarmament and is one of the most serious causes of uncertainty in Europe." The French are not hypocritical, as General von Schleicher asserts, in this disarmament question, but only illogical, or rather, since logic is their strong point, their premises are mistaken: they think that, in this modern world, security depends on preponderance of force, whereas it results in the abolition of the power to attack. Once more, we may note, that this brusque and discourteous challenge would have provoked, not so long ago, angry and prolonged feelings of hostility, but now, so strong is the will for peace, that much more attention has been paid to its substance than to its form. The prospects of peace, which depend, as all know, on the sincere friendship of France and Germany, have not been seriously shaken.

Putting Teeth  
in the  
Kellogg Pact.

We have always regarded the Kellogg Pact as, in theory, more important than the League of Nations, for it embraces practically all States, and it renounces, as plainly as words can express anything, the right which sovereign States are assumed to possess of "making war an instrument of national policy," and assumes the duty henceforward of settling national disputes, the sole cause of war, always by peaceful means. Any violator of that all-but universal agreement, solemnly ratified by, and binding upon, the peoples of the world, would necessarily, one would think, be looked upon, and treated as, a traitor by the rest, and certainly could not count on the support of any of them. Such support, indeed, those States already belonging to the League were debarred from giving, but something up to this has prevented the United States, which alone matter, from declaring that they will deny neutral rights to any violator of the Pact. However, the idea that the interdependence of nations was now so complete that henceforward there could be no "private" wars: that any armed aggressor on the rights of another State, however he might think himself justified, became, *ipso facto*, a disturber of the world's peace and should be treated as such, was voiced long ago by President Wilson even before the United States took up arms in the last war. Now, Secretary of State Stimson has spoken unequivocally in the same sense. Addressing, on August 8th, the American Council on Foreign Relations on the Pact, he said:

Hereafter, when two nations engage in armed conflict, either one or both of them must be wrongdoers—violators of this general treaty law. We no longer draw a circle about

them and treat them with the punctiliousness of the duellist code. Instead, we denounce them as law-breakers.

He went on to claim that already the signatories of the Pact had arrested, in 1929, the Sino-Russian trouble in northern Manchuria, and, as regards the Sino-Japanese dispute not yet ended, had let the belligerents know that the world would "not recognize any situation, treaty or agreement which should be brought about by means contrary to the Covenant of the League of Nations or to the Pact of Paris." This doctrine of non-recognition Mr. Hoover rightly claimed, in his "Speech of Acceptance," as one of the most important developments of his regime, declaring that "under the new international diplomacy we do not, and never will, recognize title to possession of territory, gained in violation of Peace Pacts." And the political programmes of both parties emphatically endorse this "new international diplomacy." Thus the strongest, most self-contained, most independent of World-States is gradually giving up, even in outward profession, its former anti-humanitarian, isolationist attitude. It has abandoned the legal theory of neutrality: there can be no neutral rights in a world which has condemned war as a crime against world-order. Rightly understood, this is the shrewdest blow the international arms-traffic has received in our time. When the world has branded a warring nation as a robber and a murderer, it cannot then consistently allow it to be supplied with the means of continuing its crimes.

**Revolution  
in  
International  
Law.**

In October, 1928, Mr. Baldwin said, with great truth, that the Kellogg Pact was "a conception so vast that I doubt if people have yet realized the full import of it." If they had, the War Offices of all the nations would, by this time, have been closed, and the various States would be consulting together merely to determine what share each should take in policing the highways and byways of the globe. But realization is growing. The implications of the Pact have revolutionized International Law, even more than the League of Nations has done. Mr. Stimson's speech, for instance, profoundly affected the conference of the International Law Association at Oxford at the beginning of last month, and caused a number of elaborate draft conventions concerning belligerency and neutrality on land and sea to be referred back for further consideration, in view of the new issues it raised. They were felt to be out of harmony with the Pact as now interpreted. That interpretation should affect equally profoundly the next session of the Disarmament Conference, for it goes to the root of the whole matter by suggesting the question—"What is the lawful function of armaments in a world which has renounced war?" *The Times* considers that assertion of world-solidarity

"materially improves the prospects" of the Conference, since it "offers in practice a far greater degree of security than could be given by any formal paper guarantee." And we are glad to add that France, as joint instigator of the Pact, welcomes, through her Premier, M. Herriot, Mr. Stimson's definition of the agreement as an "obligatory treaty."

**Volcanic  
South America.**

It is obvious that neither Bolivia nor Paraguay has realized the full import of the Kellogg Pact, for they have started again the sordid frontier quarrel whereby they scandalized the world in December, 1928 and which, at the world's instance, they patched up in January, 1929, by agreeing to a Protocol of Conciliation. Why they did not originally refer their dispute to the International Court or await the decision of a Conference of neutral American States at Washington, which for eight months has had the question before it, who can tell? The League has reminded them of their obligations, their neighbours have offered mediation, the Pan-American Union has put before them the new Stimsonian doctrine that alterations of territory brought about by this unjustifiable fighting will not be recognized, we may be sure the United States, whose financial interests in all these regions are immense, is doing its best to bring the hotheads to reason, but nothing seems to avail. Bolivia claims the whole region in dispute, and, only if that claim is recognized, is ready for peace! Of course, the "war" will be stopped, but meanwhile the shameful spectacle illustrates the usual process of belligerency in the pre-League world—a disputed frontier, conflict between outposts, excitement in the capitals, press-recriminations, a call for mobilization, and, finally, a conflict of armed forces—a deplorable wastage of human life and treasure, with no assurance of a just result. It is useful as an object-lesson, but one had hoped that such a foolish exhibition of unreason had become impossible. It would appear that, just as the old nations of Europe are struggling slowly and painfully to a recognition of the folly and futility of war, South America is relapsing into its former barbarism.

**Causes  
of Unrest.**

The roots of the trouble are doubtless economic. There have been Communist outbreaks in many States, notably in Chile and Peru. Brazil, a country almost as large as Europe, is in the throes of civil war. Uruguay and the Argentine have broken off relations. Ecuador is experiencing internal disturbances. Venezuela is under a dictator, and so on. In that region, if anywhere, economic co-operation is necessary for peace, but unhappily its economics are largely in the hands of foreign nations, who are fighting each other for profits. One can sympathize with Bolivia,



although it refused to sign the Kellogg Pact. It is about ten times as large as Paraguay, with more than three times the population of the latter, but it has no ready access to navigable waters. Chile, some generations back, deprived it of its Pacific ports, nor could the land-locked country persuade that State or Peru to allow it a "corridor" through their disputed territories of Tacna Arica; a gross instance, surely, of national selfishness. Now, it wants a free port on the Paraguay, and no doubt has a claim to one, at least, in equity. But instead of bargaining for it, it prefers to fight. A sinister insight into its policy appears in the fact that it secured a large loan for internal development from the United States in 1928, spent much of it, with the aid of American armament firms, and with leave of the American State Department, on erecting forts in El Chaco and otherwise arming itself, and now cannot pay the interest!

**Commonwealth  
Commercial  
Agreement.**

*The Times* reported at the end of the Ottawa Conference — "Agreement Reached" — but naturally could not disclose the terms of the agreement. No one at a distance has been able to judge whether the Commonwealth delegates at Ottawa have been able successfully to arrange trade matters to their mutual advantage, without prejudicing their commercial relations with foreign countries. That was their aim, as voiced both by Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Bennett. "By reviving and strengthening trade within the Empire," said the former, "we shall be serving the interests of civilization as a whole and taking the most practical means of hastening the economic recovery so essential to the world at large." And the Canadian Premier, for his part, said that "naturally, we shall carry past the boundaries of the Empire and establish again throughout the world that commerce which is its very life-blood." Thus, as far as words go, the selfish ideal of a self-contained commercial unit, finding all that it needs within itself, and indifferent to the fate of other units outside, has been emphatically repudiated. Such a conception would certainly be a bad preparation for the World Economic Conference on which so much hangs. The difficulty apparently experienced by a few nations of common speech and outlook in adjusting their commercial interests, so as, on the whole, to benefit each other, will be immensely greater, when all the nations of the world combine to seek their mutual profit by interchange of goods. Mammon has never hitherto looked much beyond his own interests: he has never willingly submitted to ethical guidance: to buy cheap and to sell dear, using man and machine alike as mere instruments in the process, has long been his simple Satanic creed: the Church by her doctrine of usury, her guilds of masters and workmen, and the public opinion which she created, kept him in check during

the Ages of Faith, but now he acknowledges no inner law and often defies the outer. There may be many Kreugers in our midst, who have not yet made away with themselves, and some of them may be sitting in the London Conference!

**Economic  
Co-operation  
a  
Moral Issue.**

Yet, as a striking paper in our present issue shows, the problems to be discussed are fundamentally moral. The Popes have incessantly developed that truth. Economic peace, both at home and abroad, depends upon the observance of justice and charity, whereas it is the prevalence of greed and selfishness that causes conflict. How far will those meeting in London be imbued with elementary Christian principles, or even with regard for the natural virtues of honesty and fair dealing? It would be well if representatives of the business world would formulate an ethical code for the guidance and inspiration of the Conference. There is precedent for that course. In May, 1921, a group of business men inaugurated in London "A National Movement towards a Christian Order of Industry and Commerce"—one of those many ephemeral efforts to profit by the lessons of the War which characterized its aftermath—and, before they faded away, as a dozen like zealous groups had done, set forth a series of reforms, some visionary and some practical, which aimed at restoring morality to trade relations. The fact is, a higher principle than self-interest is needed. Some general statement of the moral rules by which economic reconstruction should be governed must be framed, if the Conference is not to degenerate into an indecent struggle for materials and markets. In the possible failure of, say, the International Chamber of Commerce, not in its way an unenlightened body, to issue such a code of directions, let us quote here some extracts from that sent by the Pope through his Secretary of State to the President of the Catholic Social Week held at Lille on July 25th-30th, the subject discussed being "The Christian Conception of the International Economic Order."

**The Pope  
on  
World Unity.**

His Eminence Cardinal Pacelli wrote, speaking of the vital truths which are indispensable as the spiritual framework of a sound international economy :

There is in the first place the deep-seated unity of the great human family which, as Christ has taught, has one only Father in Heaven. There is the duty, in consequence, laid upon the members of the various nations to allow to flow copiously upon other peoples the love with which they owe in the first place to their own country. And each people is also obliged to have regard to the lawful interests of other countries. Moreover, all nations are bound to practise justice

and charity towards each other, and the States as a whole to further and to serve the common international good, as the citizens and rulers of each are bound to promote and to serve their own nearer and narrower well-being. Furthermore, at the same time, it behoves all peoples to recognize their interdependence and to adapt, to the different aspects of their unity, corresponding modes of collaboration. And if they have, in a general way, to restore health to their domestic trade, they must not do so by systematically concentrating upon themselves behind economic barriers more and more insurmountable, but rather by honourably practising those austere virtues recommended by the Pope's last Encyclical.

As tariffs, as well as debts and reparations, are excluded from the scope of this London World-Conference, it starts, as a remedial measure, with a grievous handicap. For tariffs, in general, are a denial of the world's interdependence, as well as a rejection of the Golden Rule.

**Oxford and  
Cambridge  
Summer Schools.**

That Catholics are alive to the need of a spiritual outlook in all affairs of life, including economics, was shown in the programmes of the Oxford and Cambridge Summer Schools, which this year, happily, did not altogether overlap. At Cambridge, those present under the auspices of the "School of Catholic Studies" discussed the wide theme of "Moral Principles and Practice," taking in the grounds and nature of human responsibility, and how it is exercised in regard to Property, the Family, Education and Civil and International Relations: a strenuous week indeed, for the system pursued includes classes as well as lectures. At Oxford, where the Catholic Social Guild had a record gathering, economics were more constantly to the fore, and the Papal teaching contrasted with the Bolshevik thoroughly discussed. The wider aspects of the Church's doctrine, which recognizes human solidarity, also formed part of the programme, for nationalism, political and economic, is always alien to the Catholic spirit. At the Oxford School were several delegates from Ireland, representing "The League of the Kingdom of Christ" and "Pro Fide,"—organizations of which current events in that country show the growing need.

**Affairs in  
Ireland.**

In proportion to the hopes for the intensification and spread of the true spirit of Catholicism in that restless land, aroused by the wonderful Eucharistic Congress there in June, has been our disappointment at the subsequent trend of public affairs. To those who keep in sight real moral values, the sordid political and economic struggle promoted by the present Government, without

even a clear or substantial mandate from the citizens, seems extraordinarily barren, unChristian and unnecessary. Christianity has no part in a rancorous, touchy, unforgiving nationalism, feeding its hatreds on past injustice and wasting public energies over futilities, while no attempt is made to remedy real abuses,—the abandonment of the Catholic ideal, the spread of Communism, the subservience to pagan standards, the gambling spirit, the lust for dangerous pleasures, the revolt against civil and religious authority. One obvious sign of the want of common citizenship in a country is the support of political aims by unofficial "armies." Germany is the typical example, but there are many others. Now Ireland has joined the list. The latest—the "White Army" of Dr. O'Higgins—is a direct response to that irregular revolutionary force, which the President promised to disband, but will not or dare not: a force, the main aim of which is to prevent the free expression of opinion. The Cardinal Primate has taken occasion of the great demonstration in honour of St. Patrick at the Hill of Slane, on August 15th, to denounce, "as a sin and a shame," the prolongation of the tariff-war between the two countries which is doing such harm to the weaker one. The ideals of a united Ireland, an independent Ireland, an Ireland ruled by Catholic principles, are noble and excellent, but they need to be worked for, prudently and painfully: they cannot be created by assuming they exist. We are not discussing the political issues involved, which are not our business: we are only deploring what seems unnecessary provocation of bitter feelings between two interdependent neighbours, at a time when the interests of religion and of world-peace demand methods of reason and conciliation, and when the whole influence of the Church Catholic is increasingly devoted to healing the wounds of war.

#### Spanish Unrest.

The so-called "Monarchist" revolts in Madrid and Seville happened so conveniently for the not too strong or popular Republican Government, that they might well have been staged for the purpose by the authorities themselves. They were so unsupported and unco-ordinated, so easily and ingloriously suppressed, that, whilst they put the Government into no real danger, they gave it yet another pretext for imprisoning its adversaries, confiscating their estates and suppressing what is left of an independent Press. Nothing so helps to consolidate an unconstitutional regime as an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow it. That is obviously not the form which resistance to tyranny should take amongst Spanish Catholics. The despotism was established by abuse of the ballot-box: it can be overthrown by the proper use of the same weapon. *The Times* for July 29th publishes what it calls "Light on the Spanish Revolution," viz., the number of seats

won by the Monarchy and by the Republic respectively, at the municipal elections of April 12, 1931. It was always known that the majority of seats were gained by Royalist councillors, but the exact number has now been published, viz., 22,150 Monarchists as compared with 5,875 Republicans. It may be, of course, that, since the provincial capitals, where the constituencies were larger, all went Republican, the disparity of votes as distinguished from seats may not have been so extreme. Still the possibility remains that the majority of voters in Spain are against the present Government which, in any case, seems afraid to relax its arbitrary, rigorous and extra-constitutional "Law of Defence of the Republic." Anyone can govern in a state of siege. The results of the next election may surprise Señor Azana, since "Accion Popular" has done, and is doing, much to train Catholic Spain in the rights and duties of citizenship.

**The Conversion  
of  
War Loan.**

One cannot but admire the skill with which the Government, aided by a massed Press barrage and the insistent repetitions of all its spokesmen, persuaded the vast majority of its War-Stock holders to surrender thirty shillings out of every five pounds due to them. The plan is universally styled a "bold" one, and its success—more than 90 per cent have converted—"brilliant." The Government risked refusal on a large scale, for, though it was entitled to buy out the holders, it could hardly have found the money for a really large redemption; so we presume it did act boldly, not to say audaciously. By giving a bonus of 20s. for every £100 converted, it deftly gilded the pill for the very large holders, yet to that extent lessened the relief it looked for. But the ordinary *rentier*, bluffed or cajoled into acceptance, simply suffered a sort of capital levy, consoled by the thought that he was helping the country, and by the faint hope that the relief would be felt in the next budget. *The Times* described the operation as the Government's defiance of its War-Stock holders to find a better investment than the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent which it offered, but by placing an embargo on new issues, which is not yet lifted, our rulers carefully limited the range of choice. It was cleverly done, on the whole, and much preferable to the policy of deflation whereby other States have impoverished their own and foreign bondholders.

**Fountains  
after  
Rievaulx.**

Henry VIII. suppressed a good many monasteries in his time, and others fell into decay before and since, so that if the present policy of Anglicanism of holding services in those "bare, ruin'd quires," as often as their centenaries recur, continues, it may become wearisome for Catholics to point out the incongruity

of such celebrations, and the unsoundness of the doctrinal inferences drawn from them. After Rievaulx comes Fountains, a near neighbour in origin and site. We need not dwell upon the discourtesy with which its present owner lately refused to allow Catholics to hold a service within its walls in commemoration of its eighth centenary, nor on the singular ignorance of unalterable Catholic practice displayed by the Anglican prelate who blamed us for not joining his "united service." Both are faithfully dealt with in the current (August 20th) *Tablet*. But it can never be enough insisted upon that these efforts to honour the illustrious dead come with singularly bad effect from those alien to their faith, unless accompanied by acknowledgement of, and repentance for, past errors. The Bishop's scolding of Catholics for their refusal to associate with representatives of other bodies which even Anglicans regard as heretical, gives little guarantee of that change of heart. Shortly before, the tearing down of "Catholic ornaments," condemned by an Anglican ecclesiastical court as illegal, from a Protestant church, by one of the Bishop's co-religionists, Mr. John Kensit, who boasted that he was only doing "what was done at the Reformation," proved that official Anglicanism still hates what the monks loved.

**A  
Real Monastic  
Revival.**

In his weighty discourse on occasion of the Consecration of the lately-completed Abbey Church of Buckfast on August 25th, H.E. Cardinal Bourne took the opportunity of contrasting the genuine rebirth of monasticism, illustrated by that unique celebration, with the barren appreciation of the good work of the old English monasteries, shown by certain modern Anglicans. The Cardinal appositely pointed out that the Protestant services "in commemoration of the foundation of ancient Abbeys, promoted, it is to be hoped, in a spirit of reparation, by those who can claim neither connexion nor continuity of thought or doctrine with the men who set them up," were certainly not the religious rites of which those ruined Churches were once the shrine, but rather the alien and antagonistic worship of their despoilers. As for the monastic state itself, it was the Protestant Bishop of nearby Exeter, though His Eminence did not mention the fact, who, in a recent denunciation of the religious life, before an Anglican Episcopal Synod, expressed the authentic mind of his Church. He, too, knew "what had been done at the Reformation," and what cannot be undone save by a return to the beliefs and allegiance then so definitely rejected. The restoration of Buckfast makes that return more possible, since its material and moral splendours prove beyond dispute the undying vigour and fecundity of the old Faith.

THE EDITOR.

## III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest].

## CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Economic Order:** Christian Conception of [M. E. Duthoit, quoted in *Documentation Catholique*, July 30, 1932, p. 138].

**Miracle:** its place in Apologetics [E. Masure in *Revue Apologétique*, July 1932, p. 5].

## CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**Atheism,** The New [G. M. Godden in *Irish Rosary*, August 1932, p. 565].

**Catholicism** in Spain, Historical causes of its weakness [G. W. Rushton in *Catholic Times*, August 12, 1932, p. 9].

**Causality** in Physics [H. V. Gill, S.J., in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, August 1932, p. 144; R. J. Dingle in *Month*, September 1932, p. 216].

**C.E.G.:** its work in Villages [H. Pope, O.P., in *Sower*, July 1932, p. 14].

**Mexico:** Three Generations of Persecution [J. Rimmer in *Catholic Times*, August 5, 1932, p. 12].

**Nudism** as distinct from Naturism in France [G. Lecordier in *Revue Apologétique*, July 1932, p. 58]: unhygienic and immoral [Léon Se'osse in *La Cité Chrétienne*, August 1932, p. 1090].

**Proselytism** in Education in Ireland, 1800—1832 [T. Corcoran, S.J., in *Irish Monthly*, July 1932, p. 427; August 1932, p. 457].

**Russia,** Religion under the Soviets [Bishop O'Rourke in *Homiletic Review*, July 1932, p. 1033].

**Toleration** in U.S.A. first practised by Catholics [D. C. Lawless in *America*, July 9, 1932, p. 325].

## POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Anti-Christ** in Russia no bar to business! [*Catholic Times* on attitude of *Manchester Guardian*, August 12, 1932; v. also *Tablet*, August 13, 1932, p. 204].

**Catholic Land Societies:** their ideals criticized [J. N. Blundell in *Christian Democrat*, July 1932, p. 99].

**Economic Peace-Making** [P. Maurice Hill in *Catholic Survey*, Vol. I. No. 14, p. 111].

**Eucharist,** The Saint of the (Paschal Baylon) [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Studies*, June 1932, p. 135].

**Faith,** Work for the, in an English Village [Margaret Callaghan in *Catholic Woman's Outlook*, July 1932, p. 21].

**Homes versus Flats** [Fergal M'Grath, S.J., in *Studies*, June 1932, p. 269].

**Land,** Repopulation of, a matter for the Church [Rev. J. V. Carroll, S.J., in *Clergy Review*, July 1932, p. 23].

**Monastic Commercialism,** Medieval [V. McNabb, O.P., in *Catholic Times*, August 5, 1932, p. 9].

**Race-Suicide** affecting the Commonwealth [H. Somerville in *Catholic Times*, July 15, 1932, p. 9].

**Rievaulx Abbey:** Celebration of the Eighth Centenary [Dom H. Willson, O.S.B., in *Tablet*, July 16, 1932, p. 74].

**Usury and Interest:** are they distinct? [H. Somerville in *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, July 1932, p. 216; cf. *Studies*, June 1932, p. 298].

**Usury:** Mr. Belloc's theories rejected [E. J. Coyne, S.J., in *Studies*, June 1932, p. 283].



# REVIEWS

## I—EDUCATION IN IRELAND<sup>1</sup>

THE National University of Ireland, in the publications mentioned below, written or edited by her Professor of Education, is illustrating one of the most essential functions of a University—the popularization of the fruits of learned research. It has already, during the first twenty-four years of its existence, as may be read in an incomplete list of "Academic Publications by the Teaching Staff and Other Graduates holding Higher Degrees," running to nearly one hundred pages of the *Handbook*, done an immense service to Literature and Science, and Professor Corcoran, with ten substantive volumes and innumerable articles to his credit, has set an exceptionally high standard for his own department. The first publication has nothing of the merely formal and statistical suggested by its modest title; it is a large, beautifully printed and illustrated volume, covering a wide field of educational interest and affording, in a series of chapters by the editor, a brief but most useful survey of the prolonged struggle, of some sixty years' duration, for Catholic University teaching, which only in our day has been crowned by a still imperfect triumph. That a Catholic people should have had to fight so long and so fiercely for a fundamental right is a speaking illustration of the inherent viciousness of the constitutional regime brought about by the policy of Pitt. A series of half-hearted efforts on the part of the English Government, beginning with Peel's "Godless Colleges" in Cork, Galway and Belfast, often defeated by English bigotry and always inadequate for their purpose, culminated in the Irish Universities Act of 1908 establishing the National University of Ireland. This is a Federal Body, which has three Constituent Colleges at Dublin, Cork and Galway respectively, and which, shortly after its foundation, accorded to several Faculties—Arts, Science, Philosophy and Celtic Studies—of the National Ecclesiastical Seminary of Maynooth, the status of a "Recognized Teaching College." The *Handbook* supplies full details of the constitution and character, the faculties and per-

<sup>1</sup> (1) *The National University Handbook, 1908—1932.* Edited by T. Corcoran, S.J., D.Litt. Dublin: The National University. Fully illustrated. Pp. xi. 288. 1932. (2) *The Clongowes Record, 1814—1932*, with Introduction on early Jesuit Educators, 1564—1813. By T. Corcoran, S.J., Professor of Education, University College. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd. Illustrated. Pp. xiii. 297. Price, 10s. 6d. n. 1932. (3) *Some Lists of Catholic Lay Teachers and Schools in Latin Penal Times.* Edited with Commentary, Maps and Illustrations, by T. Corcoran, S.J., D.Litt. Dublin: Gill and Son. Pp. 116. Price, 2s. 6d. n. 1932.

sonnel of the University, the degrees it is empowered to grant, its bursaries, general finance and finally, a list of its very meagre endowments. One should keep in mind that it forms a Corporation distinct from its Constituent Colleges, and as such, could have its own staff of Professors: but hitherto, save in three dissimilar ways, it has not exercised that right. It conducts the matriculation examination and that which assigns Travelling Studentships, but of more interest is the privately-founded Professorship of Catholic Theology, established in Dublin since 1913, which goes some way towards supplying a defect in the normal University curriculum. There is nothing, we presume, in the University Charter to prevent the institution by private endowment, in the lay member of the Academic Body, of those other Faculties, such as Theology, Biblical Science, and Ecclesiastical History, which Newman thought essential to his ideal University:—a great chance for that rare combination—a wealthy, and enlightened benefactor!

Each of the constituent bodies is separately described by authoritative exponents, generally their respective Presidents, so that one gets a fair idea of the history and present state of education in every part of the Free State. This impression is greatly developed by a most informative chapter by the Editor who, in order to show the sources from which the increasing supply of matriculants is drawn, makes a survey of the chief Secondary Schools of the country, illustrated by attractive photogravures of buildings and groups. Chapters on the social and athletic aspects of University life, and the astonishingly long list, before mentioned, of contributions to Literature and Science which the University in one way or another has produced, complete a noble record.

Clongowes Wood College, the foundation of which dates from the formal restoration of the Society of Jesus in 1814, celebrated its Centenary on the very eve of the Great War; and this coincidence perhaps accounts for the non-appearance, till the present year, which marks the completion of an important addition to the School buildings, of a formal history of this famous institution. A few years later another College was started as a Preparatory School near Tullamore, by the Irish Jesuits, which, grown into full academic status, was destined, sixty-eight years later, to be amalgamated with Clongowes, in the sense that it was closed as a school and much of its equipment, with many of its staff and students, joined the older College. Although school-lists and other particulars of this second College are given no attempt is made, naturally enough, to recount its separate history. That of Clongowes is divided in the periods, of 70 and 50 years respectively, before and after the amalgamation. And the whole is introduced by a survey of the educational work of

the Society in Ireland, from 1564 to the Restoration, which is in effect the history of the endeavours made by an alien and hostile Government to destroy Catholicism by forbidding the formation and action of Catholic teachers. It is a scathing revelation of the atrocious interference with elementary rights to which the policy of persecution led, and a no less inspiring account of the success with which an indomitable love of learning amongst the persecuted Irish combated the efforts made to prevent them.

The History proper of the School, drawing on a careful collection of contemporary documents, details everything of interest concerning its establishment, character and growth, and of the remarkable men who ruled and shaped its course, and resulted from its training. Readers of the corresponding history of Stonyhurst will recognize "family features" in the arrangement of studies, the religious practices and the organized games, for both systems were founded on a common *Ratio Studiorum*, and, moreover, Father Peter Kenny, who was the prime mover in the establishment of Clongowes, had undergone part of his training and had been ordained at Stonyhurst. Even the boys' uniform was originally the same in both places, and an original game of football long preceded in both places the Association and Rugby of modern times. The book is finely illustrated, including views of the recent erections, and past students of every age will rejoice in the record of their times. School-lists from the earliest times up to this year occupy over 130 pages.

Further details of the merciless war against Catholic education in later penal times waged by the Dublin "Colonial Parliaments" at the end of the seventeenth century are given by Father Corcoran's *Some Lists of Catholic Lay Teachers and their Illegal Schools*, a selection from a vast mass of material much of which awaits examination, and meant doubtless *only* as a selection, to indicate what work there is to be done in this field, and how it should be explored. The history of that ruthless penal legislation has been largely forgotten by this generation but it should be remembered if only for the light it throws on present troubles.

## 2—PRIOR PARK<sup>1</sup>

THIS interesting volume tells us much not only of the earlier history of the great estate which seems to have derived its name from the "Prior," who in the twelfth century and later, in default of any Abbot, ruled the Abbey of Bath, but also of its subsequent fortunes down to the present day. It is to be

<sup>1</sup> *Prior Park College*. By Rev. Brother J. S. Roche, B.A. With a Preface by the late Bishop of Clifton. Burns, Oates & Washbourne. Pp. xvi. 318. Price, 15s.

noted, however, that the narrative centres round the remarkable personality of Bishop Baines, and in one form or another the doings of that eminent ecclesiastic, who ruled the Western District as Vicar Apostolic from 1829 to 1843, form the subject of considerably more than half the book. It is unfortunate that, like the career of so many of the more prominent Catholic clergy of the last two centuries, a note of rather bitter controversy runs through the whole of Bishop Baines's administration, but it was he who purchased Prior Park, with great ideas of the functions which as a sort of Catholic University it was destined to fulfil, it was he who induced Father Gentili, the friend and disciple of Rosmini, to settle in England as a professor in the new foundation, it was in his time that the unfortunate fire occurred which added so great a burden to the already heavy pecuniary obligations which weighed down the undertaking he had planned, and it was he who by his needlessly outspoken criticism of the first converts of the Oxford movement incurred the censure of Rome and brought about a sad conflict of opinion in the ranks of the slender body of English Catholics. Brother Roche has dealt with Bishop Baines very gently, as perhaps he was bound to do, but the main facts of the situation are presented faithfully enough. The book is very well produced and is embellished with a large number of excellent illustrations. To those who have been pupils of the College it will always appeal as the fullest record of a great work which, reinstated as it now is upon sound financial lines, may look forward to a long career of usefulness.

---

## SHORT NOTICES

### THEOLOGICAL.

THE disconcerting attitude often taken up by modern indifferents—"Show me the use of religion and I will think about it,"—has begun to arouse a fresh treatment of theology, dealing with its influence on and relations to actual life. Such a work is *La Providence et la Confiance en Dieu*, by Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. (Desclée: 20 fr.). The author is well known, both as a professor at the Angelico, and as a writer on questions dealing with the spiritual life, and is therefore specially equipped for a work of this kind. In a former volume he has dealt with the strictly theological side of God and His Providence; here, quite independently, while traversing much of the same ground, sometimes seeming only to popularize well-established treatises, he has in his mind the application of the doctrine in hand to the practical life of our common experience. He takes those proofs of the Existence of God which rest most upon, or lead directly to, His care of the world. He dwells on those perfections which imply His Providence as their

natural or necessary corollary. In an admirable section he draws out the doctrine of the Providence of God, as it is demonstrated in the Old and New Testament. Finally he applies all this to life, dwelling on the spirit which underlies Confidence, its influence on the details of every day, its importance for anyone who would aspire to perfection. A last division, on the relation of God's Providence to His Justice and Mercy, on its development of Fraternal Charity, and on the Communion of Saints, is a section of the best kind of spiritual reading, practical, inspiring, convincing, proving how deep theology goes into the life of the Christian community.

#### MORAL THEOLOGY.

Father B. H. Merkelbach, O.P., has put all students of Moral Theology into his debt by his admirable monographs on Baptism, Penance, and Chastity. His work on Moral Theology, to be completed in three volumes, is, we believe, as valuable as that of any modern theologian. It takes a worthy place by the side of the best treatises. The second volume of the work, now to hand, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, II. (Desclée de Brouwer et Cie, Paris and Bruges: 40.00 fr.), embodies the treatment of the Moral Virtues. The author closely follows St. Thomas in his arrangement of the matter. Special references in the treatise on Justice are made to the French Civil Law. We notice that the author rejects a very probable opinion in reference to injury done by mistake (p. 296); he admits that the "family wage" is not always and necessarily due on grounds of commutative justice (p. 578), that the practice of interest-taking, though in theory indefensible, is rightly defended now on the grounds of many extrinsic circumstances and changed economic conditions (p. 612), and that (we gladly note) a lie cannot be defended on the principle of legitimate self-defence (p. 826). The third volume, that on the Sacraments, will be eagerly looked for by all students.

#### BIBLICAL.

Père Lavergne's *Evangelie selon Saint Luc* (Gabalda: 18.00 fr.), is avowedly based upon the larger work edited by Père Lagrange, but avoids any detailed treatment of the various questions that arise, merely giving the reader a running comment of a simple explanatory nature upon what he reads in the text. We do not think, therefore, that it will prove of much use to scholars, and all the less so because the Introduction is not of a high quality. We see no reason, for example, for supposing that St. Luke wrote the Gospel at Corinth (p. 6); and to make him use Mark and an extract of Matthew (p. 9) comes rather near to the "two-document" theory, forbidden by the Biblical Commission, besides doing scant justice to St. Luke's own Preface. In the main commentary, however, there are some good bits of descriptive exegesis (e.g., pp. 91-93), which should prove especially useful for meditations, retreats and the like. Now and again we have some point made of original interest, as when we are told on Luke viii. 55 that the first symptom of a supernatural cure is hunger, with a reference to the Lourdes Bulletin!

While Père Lavergne leaves a pleasant impression, Mr. Pallis's *Notes on St. Mark and St. Matthew* (Milford: 3s.: new edition) are distinctly

annoying. He is prepared to re-write the text upon such small provocation that a hint at prejudice in those who reject his conclusions (p. 5) is quite out of place. Equally wild is such a suggestion as that on Luke xiv. 3, to the effect that an episode is borrowed from Polybius. The author, however, is a modern Greek of fairly wide reading, and perhaps the most annoying thing of all is to discover original contributions here and there of sufficient value not to be overlooked!

#### PHILOSOPHY.

Father Stebbing, C.S.S.R., has a genius for successful compiling. We know him from his *Story of the Catholic Church*, his *Story of the Church in England*, and other works. Now he has published an **Outline of the History of Philosophy** (Sands: 2s. 6d.), and as a synopsis or a text-book, it would be hard to beat. The General Introduction to Philosophy at the beginning will be useful to students at the outset of their course, showing them what philosophy is, to what it leads, and how it proceeds. The Historical Introduction is admirably divided. Different schools are set apart, the leaders in those schools, usually with their chief works, are taken one by one, the characteristic tenet of each is given so far as that is possible; either at the beginning or at the end of each chapter a bird's-eye view gathers together the results of the separate stages. Father Stebbing does not argue or philosophize himself, or at least he argues very little; his aim has been to state, as shortly and clearly as possible, the different phases through which philosophy has passed, from the earliest known to the chaos of to-day. Almost unconsciously he has written a useful work of Apologetic, for the lesson of all he says is that the Universal Church must rest upon a universal philosophy, since all truth, whether natural or revealed, is one.

#### MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

If one can breathe the rarefied air of abstractions, page on page of them with little relief of illustration or concrete instance, he will delight in the masterly essay translated from Romano Guardini's *Das Gute, das Gewissen, und die Sammlung*, by Ada Lane, and called in English simply **Conscience** (Sheed & Ward: 3s. 6d.), wherein man's distinctive prerogative, the means by which God's infinite holiness is realized and reflected in a finite nature and by which alone we enter, during our life on earth, into contact with our Creator, is analysed with great thoroughness. No faculty is more misused, not only by the Godless world, but by professing believers, for conscience, if allowed at all to speak the truth, anticipates God's condemnatory judgments and prevents the sinner from having peace in his sins. Mr. Guardini aims at showing in his first two lectures the immense importance of allowing conscience to function properly and in the last gives practical methods of enabling us to hear its voice.

#### CANON LAW.

In *Religieux et Religieuses d'après Le Droit Ecclesiastique* (Museum Lessianum: 20.00 fr.), by Father J. Creusen, S.J., we have a very full commentary on the law touching Religious, and one of outstanding

merit, now in its fourth edition. The author comments on the Code, quotes other authors, brings in the Acts of the Holy See and illustrates his subject from every point of view. His range is very wide and all manner of practical questions are dealt with. It should prove a most useful book to local ordinaries and Religious Superiors. One remark may be permitted. We are surprised that, without hesitation, Father Creusen maintains that, in missionary countries, the secondary schools of "exempt" religious are not subject to the visitation of the bishop, even if he wishes to inspect the religious instruction given there. Why this privilege should be confined to missionary countries it is hard to see, seeing that it is based on a statement made in Leo XIII.'s *Romanos Pontifices*, first issued for England, which contains no hint of a special privilege. Nor is it mentioned in the canons of the Fourth Council of Westminster. It would be hard to find anyone in England who believes in the existence of such a privilege based on Leo XIII.'s Bull. The common opinion here is that in that document the Pope confirmed the ordinary privilege of exemption.

In *Religious Men and Women in Church Law* (The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee), we have a translation of the work just mentioned by Father E. F. Garesché, S.J. The translation reads well but we have one complaint, namely, the term "nun" is restricted to the women members of Religious Orders to the exclusion of members of Congregations. As the term is not thus restricted here, English readers may be surprised to find that the minister of Extreme Unction to "nuns" (*i.e.*, to all women Religious) is the ordinary confessor.

#### CHURCH HISTORY.

The Servite Fathers in Rome have been publishing facts of their history in the form of annals. The volume before us, is the twentieth in the *Monumenta Ordinis Servorum Sancte Mariae*, published in Rome. The annals contained in this volume reach from the year 1737 to the year 1750. All manner of interesting details are given, mostly in Latin, of members of the Servite Order noteworthy for their piety, for their learning, and for their apostolic work. There is a noteworthy account of the introduction of the Servite Nuns into Bavaria, which quotes the diary of one of the nuns who went there first. Also at the end of the volume there are interesting documents dealing with the studies prescribed for the members of the Servite Order which throw light on the ideas of the time.

#### HISTORICAL.

Another volume of that excellent series of Dissertations published by the Catholic University of America (Washington, D.C., U.S.A.) is *The Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England*, by Sister Mary of the Incarnation Byrne. The author has searched every nook and corner of mediæval as well as modern literature for traces of the nun in Earlier England; her bibliography alone, and it is only a selection, covers over twenty closely-printed pages. The results of her researches she has compared one with another, and then has woven them together into a whole. She has used her own knowledge and experience of religious life



to interpret many passages and allusions which would naturally escape the ordinary lay-reader; her ample quotations, to illustrate the points she makes, alone make the book a thing of beauty and value. At the close of each section a summary is given, bringing together her conclusions. She is struck, and the reader is no less, with the likeness that prevails throughout, from Alcuin and before him to our own time, in the nun as literature reveals her to us. There are differences in detail; each age has its own atmosphere, stresses its own peculiar ideal, responds to influences brought to bear upon it from home or abroad; nevertheless, the background is easily to be recognized, the family traits are the same. This is an excellent and original study, which should be of special interest to many in England, not only nuns.

Father Ailbe J. Luddy, O.Cist., of Mount Melleray, has of late produced many books connected with his Order and its Founder, St. Bernard. In his latest work, **The Order of Citeaux** (Gill and Son: 4s.), he deals with the Order itself. Beginning with Monasticism as it existed before the time of St. Benedict and after, the author proceeds to sketch the story of the origin and first days of the Cistercian Order, culminating in St. Bernard, who, of course, occupies considerable space. In the chapter on its Diffusion, something is said of the Military Orders who were under its jurisdiction. The Decline and Restoration follow, with emphasis on De Rancé, whom the author has ably defended in another place. Finally, having looked on the Order from outside, Father Luddy dwells upon the Cistercian Spirit, describing the making of a Cistercian monk, the spirituality and observances peculiar to his life, and the benefits he confers on Society at large. This little book contains much in small space, and is written with true devotion to the cause for which it stands.

There may be a limited number of readers in England at present interested in the last of the Napoleons; nevertheless, for them and for those concerned with the history of last century, **Napoléon III: Speeches from the Throne, together with Proclamations and some Letters from the Emperor**, by Robert Holmes Edleston, F.S.A., F.R.G.S. (Severs, Cambridge), is a book of reference which cannot be overlooked. The author calls the Emperor "the greatest Liberal who ever occupied a throne," and seeks to substantiate his claim by the words and decrees of his hero (we can use no other term), ranging from 1851 to 1863. Incidentally, by means of introductions and connecting notes, we are given an insight into the inner history of the period from the author's own commendable point of view. For the general reader these documents reveal a man of singular interest, not to say charm, alive to many duties, more successful than the end seemed to warrant, deserving better of France than the lot he received.

Though we believe that Father Joseph J. Williams, S.J., is right in his conclusion, still we would not say that he has proved his case in his well-documented study: **Whence the Black Irish of Jamaica?** (The Dial Press: \$2.00). His argument is rather that of enthymeme than of syllogism. There are black people in Jamaica with Irish names; Irish people were deported from Ireland by Cromwell; therefore the former are descended from the latter. The conclusion is not obvious. Not all the Indian Christians who bear Portuguese names are descended

from the Portuguese; in our own time we can watch Indians adopting English names, who have no western blood in them at all. Still, the author may be right; though we cannot help suspecting that his book has been written for another purpose than merely to supply an answer to the title on its title page.

An interesting, if somewhat discursive, essay in Church History is **The Dynasty of Pius, a Study in the Papacy**, by Gerald Wynne Rushton (B.O. & W.: 2s.). The author has conceived the idea of bringing together all the eleven Popes who have borne the name of our present Holy Father, and seeing what their successive reigns may tell us in regard to the Papacy itself. He has a vigorous style; he writes with youthful enthusiasm; he has no patience with "the prevaricator of truth" (p. 12); and he writes with joy and devotion. Though an essay of this kind, covering so much matter in so short a space, cannot touch more than the surface, still it reveals no small reading and reflection, and suggests that we have here a new author from whom much may be hoped for in the future.

In ample time for the celebration of the third Centennial of the foundation of Catholic Maryland in 1934, Father H. S. Spalding, S.J., has produced a history of the Colony from the beginning to the establishment of American Independence calling it **Catholic Colonial Maryland** (The Bruce Publishing Co.: \$2.50). Our readers may remember a pleasing sketch from the same pen of the old-time migration of the English Catholic Settlers into Kentucky, which appeared in our pages last year and which showed that Father Spalding had the local history at his fingers' ends. The same intimate knowledge and gift of expression appears in this fully-documented and finely-illustrated volume, which is of especial interest to Catholics as indicating how the children of the Church fleeing from the Cromwellian persecution, practised in their new surroundings the principles of true religious toleration and embodied them in the Act of 1649, thence to be transferred to the written constitution of the United States, though not yet perfectly illustrated in their practice. The names and exploits of Baltimore and Carroll, the one prominent at the beginning and the other at the end of this stirring story, should convince even bigotry that the State has nothing to fear, but rather much to hope for, from the assertion of Catholic principles.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL.

The Abbey of Rievaulx has recently been prominent in our papers, but few know much of one of the greatest Englishmen who ruled it for twenty years. We are therefore indebted to Mr. T. Edmund Harvey for his carefully written study, **St. Aelred of Rievaulx** (Allenson: 3s. 6d.), which has recently appeared. The author has based his work mainly on the contemporary *Life*, written by Walter Daniel of Rievaulx, a friend and disciple of the saint. It is a touching and telling story, which rings true at every turn, not least in those pages which speak of the miraculous. With keen insight and sympathy Mr. Harvey has known how to complete the picture of the saint by the use of his own words, giving us the portrait of a perfect monk, at the same time of one whose

outstanding virtue was the love of others, whether inside or outside the cloister. The history of the period is made to throw light on the life of the saint; at the same time we are allowed to see his personal industry, both in the development of Rievaulx and in his writings which, for the time, are numerous. Some extracts from St. Aelred's "Speculum Charitatis," given at the end of the book, help us to realize the fascination of this much-loving and much-loved servant of Our Lord, conspicuous among others of his time, even when England could still claim to be an island of saints.

In a brochure of 82 pages, entitled *Fleur du Calvaire* (Desclée, Paris: 6.00 fr.), Father R. P. Conrad Gury, O.F.M., stirs our enthusiasm for another holy soul of our time, Sœur Marie-Fidèle, a Franciscan nun who died in 1923. This is an able synopsis of the larger life which appeared a short time ago; by a series of summaries instead of chapters the reader is easily made to visualize the portrait that is drawn.

One of the features of our time is the gradual purifying of the stream of English history from the taint of the Great Protestant Tradition. Naturally enough, Catholics are prominent in this work and indeed are relatively numerous. Amongst these must be reckoned Mr. G. C. Heseltine who, in his *William of Wykeham: a Commentary* (B.O. & W.: 6s.), sets himself to vindicate the great Chancellor from that anachronistic Protestantism with which biased historians have striven to endow him. Mr. Heseltine is quite aware of the clerical corruption of the times, and of the grounds, in certain aspects of Papal policy, for antagonism on the part of the Crown, and he judges events in their contemporary atmosphere. As a result the founder of Winchester and New College stands out as the foremost figure of his time, a good Churchman and a sound patriot. Catholic teachers, puzzled as to the attitude they should assume with regard to the quarrels between Church and State which are so frequent in English history, will find much to help them here.

We seem to notice in France, as well as elsewhere, a growing tendency to apply titles to books which give no idea whatever of their contents. For instance, one before us, *Gerbe de Merveilles*, by Dom G. Meunier, O.S.B. (Téqui: 7.00 fr.), might mean almost anything; in fact, it contains two summary and edifying accounts of the recently canonized St. Marie-Madeleine Postel, foundress of the Institute of the Sisters of the Christian Schools of Mercy, and of her successor in the government of the Institute, Mother Placide Viel, whose cause has also been submitted for examination. This shorter volume is meant to take the place of the larger life of St. Marie-Madeleine, for those who are not able to procure the latter.

The French life of Abbot Marmion of Maredsous, written by Dom R. Thibaut with the title *Un Maître de la Vie Spirituelle* and published two years ago (See *THE MONTH*, May, 1930, p. 462-4), has been excellently translated by Mother Mary St. Thomas of Tyburn Convent, the skilled translator of all his "Works" (Sands & Co.: 15s. n.), and will be eagerly welcomed by the many both here and in Ireland who have been spiritually nourished on his admirable ascetical treatises. Dom Thibaut makes the great monk live before us, with copious extracts from his letters and other writings, and we see how truly his books, which were all Spiritual Conferences, were "lived" by him-

self before being spoken and written down for the edification of his own children and the Catholic world.

In a quite new way Mme Marie Gasquet brings home to her readers the beauty and the fruits of the Feast of Corpus Christi in her little work, *La Fête-Dieu* (Flammarion: 10 fr.). Written in the form of addresses to young people, and with the life of the spoken word in them, her chapters tell the story of Juliana of Cornillon, of Pope Urban IV., of Thomas Aquinas, and of the part each took in the establishment of the Feast. Other chapters follow, developing the practices which have grown around the Blessed Sacrament, down to the Eucharistic Congresses of our own time. The style of the book seems to us singularly happy; one would judge that the author is a born teacher.

#### DEVOTIONAL.

Many will welcome the extracts from Canon Auguste Saudreau's *The Degrees of the Spiritual Life* which are published in a neat shilling volume entitled—*Towards Perfect Love and the Practice of Mental Prayer*, by Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. The directions given and the methods proposed for advance in the love and service of God are both simple and encouraging.

Few of us will question that the best of all Prayer Books is the Missal. After the Missal, for the priest and Religious at least, come the Breviary and the Ritual. Prayer in them is not only private meditation; it is alive with the life of the Church. The forms of prayer in them are the fruit of generations of experience; they express the mind of the Christian from the beginning. To bring this more home to us, to let us see how intimately the prayers of the Church express the sublimest things in the spiritual life, is the aim of *La Spiritualité Chrétienne d'après la Liturgie*, by R. P. Antoine de Sérent, O.F.M. (Desclée, Bruges). It is a work specially for priests and religious, and for students of the liturgy; it is not intended to be easy reading. Following the prayers which the Church has appointed, for the conferring of the Sacraments, for the Divine Office, for the Mass, the author shows us how the mind is trained to think and to pray in a full cycle, both of theology and of union with the life of Our Lord.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

A large, well-produced book—*The Face of London* (Simpkin, Marshall, Ltd.), by Mr. Harold P. Clunn and published at the unbelievable price of 7s. 6d. net, contains an introduction, a conclusion, accounts of twenty-five "walks" and five "drives," a sixty-page index of names and nearly 200 illustrations, from old prints or modern photographs, most of them very good, and several maps: all concerned with the growth of London and its "dormitories" during the last century. How it is done, we cannot conceive. It also relates, in a lively and yet erudite way, the history of those London streets that we now patrol. It will enchant the amiable anecdotist; and save no end of time to the serious student. Readers interested in the mind of their fellow-men will ask, maybe, how on earth the great Victorian era tolerated much of the shoddy stuff erected during it; how anyone, *per contra*, could have been so mad as

to pull down any of the good stuff (old St. Paul's school for example); and just what it is that is making us put up the sort of semi-Assyrian architecture we now see around us. No doubt, we are rightly disgusted with terra-cotta and stucco affectations: but artificial stone, thinly veiling steel skeletons, is not very attractive; when walls are evidently but an inch or two thick, the "massive" effect is but a sham, which does not always deceive. It would seem, alas!, that much of our new architecture is a revolt not only against "prettiness," but against spirituality; that its plainness is often due really to unconfessed poverty; and its brutality, to a would-be glorification of the Robot-age.

Few of the candidates for a place in the dainty little series issued by Messrs. Dent & Sons and called "Mediaeval Towns" have such an undisputed right to be chosen as the ancient capital of Alfred's Wessex, and in *The Story of Winchester* (5s. 6d. n.), by W. Lloyd Woodland, that right is amply vindicated. It is a complete record of the town from earliest to modern times, excellently illustrated by phototypes and line-drawings by Adrian de Frislon, with exact topographical details and copious anecdotes regarding eminent personages connected with it. Religious matters, however, are treated from the ordinary Protestant standpoint, and this may account for the omission of any mention of Bishop Milner amongst Winchester's famous citizens, although the author must have known of the Bishop's valuable "History and Antiquities of Winchester."

#### LITERARY.

Since Horstmann's publication of the works of Richard Rolle a generation ago, the Hermit of Hampole has certainly come to his own; and though it is the custom with some students to depreciate Horstmann's edition, they must confess that they owe much to his pioneering labour. We are gratified to find that Miss Hope Emily Allen, in her new volume, *English Writings of Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole* (Clarendon Press: 7s. 6d.), is by no means on that side; a scholar herself, she recognizes the worth of others, with all their limitations and inaccuracies. The work before us is mainly one for students. The Introduction is a masterpiece of its kind, giving us not only the life, but also the character of Rolle, mainly as described by himself, and, again, with a scholar's intuition, supporting herself by the evidence and conclusions of those who have studied the subject before her. The volume is one of selections from the writings of Richard Rolle; but they are so admirably introduced that we may say we have here his best authentic work. They are printed in the author's own English; which will not be difficult to the ordinary reader of the literature of the period. The notes at the end are exhaustive, and display both great knowledge of the literature of the period, and keen discernment between truth and falsehood. We have nothing but praise for this admirable and patient piece of work.

#### FICTION.

Not altogether the last work of his to be translated, since another has appeared since its publication and his death, M. René Bazin's *Magnificat* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne: 7s. 6d.) has all the characteristics which the lamented author's readers have learnt to expect and love—the

picturesque landscape-setting and intimate home-details of his dear Bretons, and the no less delicate delineation of the workings of divine grace in Catholic souls. Only those who do not see beyond this life will see tragedy in the thwarted affections of a young girl who falls in love with a companion who has already heard the divine call to the priesthood, although one might have wished that he had made his intention manifest before matters had gone so far. But all the characters, parents and family alike, are ennobled by the text.

Miss Noel Macdonald Wilby has lately joined the ranks of those talented woman writers who have found inspiration in the Catholic records of persecution times. Mgr. Benson set or emphasized the vogue, but even his prolific output could not exhaust the material. From sundry other writings of hers we know how thoroughly steeped Miss Wilby is in the history of the times, and this well-digested knowledge is skilfully displayed in *Two Fortunate Orphans* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne: 3s. 6d.), an historical romance centring round the great figures of More and Fisher but stopping short of their tragic—or glorious—change of fortunes. We can conceive no better way of learning the spirit of those days, or indeed the characters of the blessed martyrs, than by reading this charming story.

The *Happy Endings* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne: 2s.), which the same gifted writer describes in a shorter book, are also based on the history of Catholic England—episodes illustrating the habits, civil and devotional, of its inhabitants before loss of Faith caused loss of merri-ment. One story, however, not the least attractive, deals with ancient Bruges, although even there introducing the writer's hero, Blessed Thomas More. The booklet is nicely illustrated with woodcuts by Dorothy Mills.

#### VERSE.

The English are credited with producing the best lyrical poetry in the world; if so, a new lyrical poet is at a disadvantage, in that he has a high standard set before him by which he has to be estimated. Mr. James Steel in *Lyrical Poems* (B.O. & W.: 5s.), has ventured to compete for the crown, with what success there will be different opinions, as there usually are. He possesses the first essential of modern poetry, a command of words and phrases, and an ear for the lilt of verse. For his subject-matter, there is an ever-recurring note of melancholy, hovering round death and its ending, brought into sharp contrast with the sensuous, but not sensual, aspect of love. He plays upon the surface of life and affection, but with a delicacy that is sensitive to receive impressions of every emotion about him.

"A slim book of poems," entitled *Change*, by G. H. Murphy (Pear Tree Press, Flansham, Sussex: 7s. 6d.), of which only a hundred copies are printed, by hand, on Japon Vellum, contains twelve sets of verses, of which one may say at once that they revel in colour and imagery, till the simplest idea catches the attention. We are reminded of some slim lady dressed to be presented at Court, with the feathers in her hair, and the long train drawn out behind. Sometimes a light from a stone will catch the eye, and make us wonder at its beauty. The author watches nature in its simplest forms, "the light along the water and the wet and shining stones," and from them draws most of his inspiration.

## MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

We have five new C.T.S. twopenny pamphlets to review this month: **Wonder Night**, a beautiful little Nativity play by Florens Roch, **A Child's Life of Philippine Duchesne** (that is, a Life for children), by Teresa Lloyd, narrates in an attractive way all the main events in the life of that holy and "venerable" friend and religious child of Saint Sophie Barat, and **A Sign of Love**, by Mrs. B. R. Sutton, which turns on a particularly spectacular miracle at Lourdes, which is vouched for as true but is charmingly embellished with fictional details. In **What you see in a Catholic Church**, by Father C. C. Martindale, the author continues his Apostolate of making the Faith and its practice intelligible to a country which has lapsed into materialism. It is embellished with a curious Cubistic representation of a church interior. Finally, **The Handbook of Catholic Societies, Organizations, Charities and Activities in the Archdiocese of Westminster**, published in conjunction with the Westminster Catholic Federation, provides a much-needed survey of "Catholic Action" in the premier See. In the smaller format is a very dainty reprint of Newman's immortal poem—**The Dream of Gerontius**, with a valuable Introduction by Father H. Tristram. Amongst reprints is **Religion**, by Rev. R. Traill, which is now in its tenth thousand.

**Elbow Room for the Faith** is an eloquent plea for supporting "returning to the land" under Catholic auspices—which may now be done in several parts of the country. The title, abstract and enigmatic, belies the contents of the book, which are exceedingly practical, showing that Catholics must make a beginning of the reconstruction of Society and that the nucleus of a Christian order is the Family Subsistence Farm. Captain Reginald Jebb writes with vigour and point, and "would that his words might reach the rich!"—that is, would that Catholics with means had also the insight to save themselves and their generation on the lines indicated by the Popes and faithfully followed here. The lecture is published at 1d. by the Midlands Catholic Land Association.

The *Catholic Mind* for July 22nd and August 8th (5 cents) preserves in handy form some useful articles—**The Pope and the Missions**, by Dr. H. Ahaus, from the *Clergy Review*; **Economic Peace-making**, by Mr. P. Maurice Hill, from *A Catholic Survey*; and **Cæsarism, Conscience and War**, a plea for the literal acceptance of the Kellogg Pact, from our own pages.

Amongst the *Envois de la Maison de la Bonne Presse* (Rue Bayard, Paris) we commend **La Dernière Volonté de Guido Lapini**, by Alice Meunier, a gripping romance of the Middle Ages, full of dramatic episodes; **L'Etoile Rouge**, by M. M. d'Armagnac, a realistic story of the Russian Revolution of unflagging interest, with a happy ending; **Roselle**, by Guy Wirta, a touching account of a child missionary, but, human nature being what it is, more edifying than probable; and **Annette et Marcien**, by Max Colomban, a pleasant tale of the French countryside, well written, and natural in style. The **Almanach des Vacances** (1.25 fr.), from the same firm, is full of short stories, jokes, puzzles, and of much that will amuse our young folks during their holidays. Excellent value for 1.25 fr.

**Pâques and Fête-Dieu**, two volumes from the admirable series **L'Année en Fêtes Pour Nos Enfants**, now being published by Desclée de Brouwer et Cie, Paris, cannot be too highly recommended.



## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER**, New York.  
*Reflections on the Litany of the Sacred Heart*. By Raphael V. O'Connell, S.J. Pp. xii. 237. Price, \$1.00.
- ASCHENDORFF**, Münster.  
*Opuscula et Textus*: fasc. xii.
- BASIL BLACKWELL**, Oxford.  
*Professor Herford as an Italian Scholar*. By Edmund G. Gardner. Pp. 22. Price, 1s. n.
- BRUCE PUBLISHING CO.**, New York.  
*Experimental Psychology*. By Hubert Gruender, S.J. Pp. ix. 455. Price, \$2.50. *Favourite Newman Sermons*. By Rev. Daniel O'Connell, S.J. Pp. xii. 413. Price, \$3.00.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE**, London.  
*Notes on the Apocalypse*. By E. Bonello. Pp. 32. Price, 1s. *Of Familiar Intercourse with God in Prayer*. By Ven. Louis de Pont, S.J. Pp. xxx. 306. Price, 6s. *In the Footprints of a Saint and other Sketches from Spain*. By Helen H. Colville. Pp. 218. Price, 5s. *In Praise of St. Joseph*. By Mother Mary Philip, I.B.V.M. Pp. x. 82. Price, 2s. 6d. *Back to Christ*. By Rev. Jacques Leclercq. Translated by Rev. Francis Day. Pp. xix. 260. Price, 6s. *The Log Book of a Dream Ship*. Illustrated. By Dorothy Mills. Pp. 67. Price, 3s.
- CENTRAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY**, Dublin.  
*Catalogue of Novels and Tales by Catholic Writers*. By Stephen J. Brown, S.J. Pp. 83. Price, 1s.
- DESCLEE DE BROUWER**, Paris.  
*L'Amitié Avec Dieu*. By H. D. Noble, O.P. Pp. 538. Price, 15.00 fr.
- EDITIONS SPES**, Paris.  
*Les Grandes Activités de la Société des Nations devant la Pensée Chrétienne*. Pp. 266. Price, 15.00 fr.
- FIMIN-DIDOT**, Paris.  
*Contre Pie VII et Bonaparte*. By Abel Dechéne. Pp. 230. Price, 15.00 fr.
- FLAMMARION**, Paris.  
*Pie X*. By René Bazin. Pp. 126. Price, 3.75 fr. *Saint Anne de Beaupré*. By Robert Rumilly. Pp. 179. Price, 10.00 fr.
- LONGMANS**, London.  
*An Introduction to Pneumatology*. By J. C. McKerrrow. Pp. 179. Price, 9s. n.
- MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS**.  
*The Nature and the Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli*. By Decima L. Douie. Pp. xviii. 291. Price, 17s. 6d.
- MARIETTI**, Turin.  
*Annus Mystico-Augustinianus*. Vols. I. and II. By Fr. Nazareni Petrelli, O.S.A. *Ceremoniale iuxta Ritum Romanum*. By P. A. Maria de Carpo, O.M. Pp. xxvii. 816. Price, 25.00 l.
- PONT. INST. ORIENTALIS**, Rome.  
*De Oriente Documenta, Studia et Libri*. Pp. 266.
- SANDS & CO.**, London.  
*Abbot Marmion*. By Dom Raymond Thibaut. Translated by Mother Mary St. Thomas. Illustrated. Pp. xiv. 488. Price, 15s. n. *A Scottish Montessori School*. By a Sister of Notre Dame. Illustrated. Pp. 128. Price, 5s. n. *Conception Island*. By Raymond Devas, O.P. Illustrated. Pp. xv. 436. Price, 12s. 6d. n.
- SEVERS**, Cambridge.  
*Napoleon III*. By R. H. Edleston. Pp. 360.
- SHED & WARD**, London.  
*The Life of the Church*. By various authors. Edited by M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Pp. 137. Price, 7s. 6d. *The Irish Way*. By various authors. Edited by F. J. Sheed. Pp. viii. 343. Price, 6s.
- SIGN OF THREE CANDLES**, London.  
*The National University of Ireland: Handbook*. 1908—1932. Edited by T. Corcoran, S.J. Illustrated. Pp. xi. 288.
- SODALITE DE S. P. CLAVER**, Rome.  
*Le Répertoire Africain*. By Henri Dubois, S.J. Pp. xvii. 399.
- S.P.C.K.**, London.  
*Christian Mysticism*. By P. E. More. Pp. 111. Price, 3s. 6d.
- "VITA E PENSIERO"**, Milan.  
*Contributi del Laboratorio di Statistica*. Second Series. Pp. 145. Price, 12.00 l. *La Poesia di S. Gregorio Nazianzeno*. By Michele Pellegrino. Pp. 126. *La Riforma Degli Studi Universitari Negli Stati Pontifici (1816—1824)*. By Rev. A. Gemelli, O.F.M., and S. Vismara, O.S.B. Pp. viii. 398. Price, 25.00 l.

